

PHYSICAL EDUCATION FOR WOMEN IN MODERN TIMES

REPORT OF A SYMPOSIUM

HELD AT WELLESLEY COLLEGE JUNE 26, 27, 28, 1952

SPONSORED BY

THE HYGIENE AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION SECTION

OF THE

WELLESLEY COLLEGE ALUMNAE ASSOCIATION

GV
439
W440
1952

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Committees | 4 |
| Program | 5 |
| A Philosophy of Education for College Women, by Margaret Clapp | 9 |
| The Role of Women in Society Today and Its Challenge to Education, by Lillian Gilbreth | 15 |
| Open Forum Discussion | 26 |
| Discussion Groups | 28 |
| General Education | 28 |
| Teacher Education | 28 |
| An Anthropologist's View of Mid-Century America, by Mary Ellen Goodman . | 31 |
| Open Forum Discussion | 35 |
| Discussion Groups | 40 |
| General Education | 40 |
| Teacher Education | 40 |
| Women, Work, and Marriage, by Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy | 42 |
| Discussion Groups | 51 |
| General Education | 51 |
| Teacher Education | 52 |
| Assets and Liabilities of Women in Human Relationships, by Esther Lloyd-Jones | 54 |
| Open Forum Discussion | 63 |
| Discussion Groups | 66 |
| General Education | 66 |
| Teacher Education | 66 |
| Women's Responsibility in the World Crisis, by Olive Remington Goldman . | 68 |
| Open Forum Discussion | 75 |
| Final Summaries and Evaluation | |
| General Education Group Discussions | 76 |
| Teacher Training Group Discussions | 78 |
| Recreation Group Discussions | 79 |
| Evaluation and Summary of the Symposium | 80 |
| Honored Alumnae | 82 |
| Physical Education Symposium Registrants | 85 |

PROGRAM

"PHYSICAL EDUCATION FOR WOMEN IN MODERN TIMES"

A Symposium

Wellesley College
June 26, 27, 28, 1952

Sponsored by: The Hygiene and Physical Education Section of
the Wellesley College Alumnae Association

Speakers

Dr. Margaret Clapp, President of Wellesley College
Dr. Lillian Gilbreth, Industrial Engineer, Montclair, New Jersey
Mrs. Olive Remington Goldman, U.S. Representative to the United Nations
Dr. Mary Ellen Goodman, Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology,
Wellesley College
Dr. Esther Lloyd-Jones, Professor of Education, Teachers' College,
Columbia University
Dr. Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy, Professor of Sociology, Connecticut College

Group Discussion Leaders and Summarizers

General Education

Leader: Sally Houston, H.P.E. '35, Assistant Professor, Oberlin College
Summarizer: Dorothy Bateman, Director of Physical Education, Cornell Univ.

Recreation

Leader: Helen Petrosky, H.P.E. '26, Director of Physical Education,
Hiram College
Summarizer: Doris M. Hannan, H.P.E. '40, Associate Professor, Cedarcrest
College

Teacher Education

Leader: Barbara Gill, H.P.E. '39, Professor, State Teachers College,
Brockport, New York
Summarizer: Dorothy Waterman, H.P.E. '19, Instructor in Health Education,
Bayside High School, New York City

SESSIONS

Thursday, January 26

Morning

11:00-12:00 Dr. Ruth Elliott, H.P.E. '14, Presiding
Plan of the Symposium: Gertrude M. Baker
"A Philosophy of Education for College Women": Pres.
Margaret Clapp

12:30

Lunch

10:30-12:00 Discussion in Groups

12:30 Lunch: L. Schultz Kjellstrom, H.P.E. '32, Presiding
"Women's Responsibility in World Crisis": Olive Remington
Goldman

Afternoon

2:00-3:00 Elizabeth Rearick, H.P.E. '22, Presiding
Evaluation and Summary of the Symposium

OFFICIAL OPENING OF SYMPOSIUM BY MISS RUTH ELLIOTT

It is my privilege to call to order this Symposium on "Physical Education for Women in Modern Times." The Symposium is sponsored by the Hygiene and Physical Education Section of the Wellesley College Alumnae Association.

On behalf of Wellesley College and the Graduate Department of Hygiene and Physical Education I welcome each and every one of you to our campus. We are especially pleased to have the Eastern Association of Physical Education for College Women hold its annual meeting here with us.

The alumnae are to be congratulated for starting plans for this Symposium over two years ago. As a result of their foresight this is the only conference to be held on the Wellesley College campus this summer. The construction of two new dormitories, which will be opened in September prevents others from enjoying the privilege afforded us. We are indeed grateful for the special favor granted this group.

Gertrude Baker, president of our alumnae association is Director of Physical Education for Women at the University of Minnesota. We are greatly indebted to her for having conceived of the idea of this conference. There is not time to enumerate her many outstanding contributions to the growth and development of Physical Education in the United States. May I simply say we are proud to claim her as one of our most distinguished alumnae. May I introduce Gertrude Baker to you who will explain the plan of the Symposium.

Introduction of President Margaret Clapp

I am confident that Miss Margaret Clapp, president of Wellesley College, needs no introduction to the greater part of this audience. However, I am pleased to enumerate a few interesting facts which will show her breadth of interests and the recognition of her attainments. Miss Clapp is the 8th president of Wellesley College and the 2nd alumnae president. She succeeded president Mildred McAfee Horton on July 1st 1949.

Our president is an historian. She was a member of the history department at Brooklyn College prior to her election to the presidency of Wellesley College. In 1948 she was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for her biography "Forgotten First Citizen: John Bigelow." This was her dissertation for her Ph.D. degree which she received from Columbia University in 1946. She has received 3 honorary LL.D degrees, from Smith College, Northeastern University and Mt. Holyoke College.

Miss Clapp is a trustee of Walnut Hill School and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a member of the Advisory Board of the Hispanic Society of America, a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a director of the William Filene's Sons Company, a member of the Problems and Policies Committee of the American Council in Education, the New England Committee of the National Planning Association, the Board of Foreign Scholarships of the State Department and the National Laywomen's Committee of the National Council of Churches of Christ. Recently Miss Clapp spoke at the Founder's Day exercises of the New Jersey College for Women on "A Humanist Looks at the Education of the Twentieth Century Woman" and to the faculty of that college on "Education for Whom and for What." I am pleased to present President Clapp who will speak to us on "A Philosophy of Education for College Women."

A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION FOR COLLEGE WOMEN
PRESIDENT MARGARET CLAPP

One of the happy privileges which I have on occasion is to express for the College its pleasure in the return of alumnae and in the visits to Wellesley of their friends. We welcome you; we hope you enjoy the campus and its facilities. (We hope you enjoy warm weather though as to that the hope is without much expectation of fulfillment.) Most of all we hope that you find in these three days pleasure in renewing old friendships and strengthening recent acquaintance, and stimulus in the programs and discussions which your Steering Committee has arranged. Wellesley is glad that you are here and it joins you in thanking your committees, and Miss Elliott and the staff of the Department of Hygiene and Physical Education, for all of the planning which has made the conference possible.

As I understand it, the programs and discussions that lie ahead are planned for women whose fundamental professional interest is in education, especially in the education of women on the college level, and whose special professional interest lies in the contribution of physical education to the whole of education.

I trust that that represents your view for two reasons. The first is unimportant and selfish: I cannot talk with you in the field of your special professional interest. I am too ignorant. The other is of utmost importance and marks the distinction between the educator and the trainer. The trainer is content to inculcate certain skills and attitudes, and stops there - whether he is a trainer in physical education, in history, or in any other area. The educator is profoundly concerned with the total experience provided the young; he is concerned with the disciplines and opportunities which his special field can contribute to the wholeness of education in a particular institution.

Look for a moment at any special field of subject matter or activity. It has particular demands and requirements within itself, particular techniques, and offers particular rewards. So, whether it is taught in a high school or graduate school, in a liberal arts college or a vocational school, it has an identity of its own. Baseball as played by sixth graders and the National League has identifiable similarities. Study of colonial America whether in a vocational or liberal arts college has evident similarities. There is difference of degree, or emphasis, of depth, but not of kind.

It is the business of the educator to recognize those differences of degree, of emphasis and of depth; to adjust what he teaches accordingly, and yet without violating the basic truths and offerings of his field. So the person who would use his special field as a contributing factor in the total educational experience which a college offers must go beyond his field in order to develop a comprehensive sense of the whole institution. He must be aware of its purposes and he must seek to learn more and more of how his field relates to other fields and how it relates to the total curriculum and to the extracurricular activities provided in a particular place for the education of each individual student.

Obviously a teacher cannot spend much of his time contemplating and talking generalities about the comprehensive purpose of education. He would degenerate into an empty talking piece. He needs a special field through which to impart to students the particulars which are essential to them, if they are to get value, for their total education, from the skills which he has. He will spend the bulk of his time and thought on his own special field, adding to his understanding of it, adding to

his ability to convey his knowledge, to stimulate his students to seek knowledge, and to show them how to seek it for themselves. But constantly he as a teacher will have at the back of his mind awareness of how what he is doing relates to what other teachers are doing, and of how all of them together contribute to common educational goals.

So, with allowances for the pitfalls in any generality, one might say that an axiom in college teaching is that a primary qualification is competence in a special field and insight into how that field may serve the over-all philosophy of the particular institution in which one works.

I get pleasure, sometimes, in mental play with analogies. One day this year I found myself playing with the idea that a faculty is like a string of beads. In a liberal arts college the beads are wondrously diverse - one wants as many shapes and sizes and colors as one can get. One could have a string of matched pearls in such an institution but it would be disastrous. A professional school is quite different. A school of archeology, for example, or a theological seminary, or a graduate school of physical education needs a faculty that can be likened to the string of matched, graduated pearls, each one closely related to the next, not quite identical with but adding to the complete representation of a whole single field.

But whether diversity or likeness in interests and skills is of primary importance - that is, whether one is concerned with undergraduate general education or with specialized advanced education or technical or professional education, note, in my analogy, that the beads are not separate and apart, rolling every which way and liable to be lost. No, they are threaded on a strong string. And that is a thread of common purpose running through all the members. It must not be a coarse rope; it must not be a flimsy, easy to unravel thread. Unobtrusively and strongly it must bind the members together into a unity. The observer sees and delights in the individual beads, but without seeing, he knows that inside each one runs that common thread - that core of basic dedication to a common purpose.

One cannot learn in graduate school what that purpose is or should be for every institution. One cannot teach it. One can learn competence in one's own field, but one cannot learn the purpose in all education because there is not any one fixed purpose for all educational institutions. Not in a free country. The would-be college teacher, fresh from professional training, should have ideas as to what sort of educational institution he personally finds most interesting to be in and what educational ideals he holds highest. (I might add that one would hope he would be willing to change his ideas should experience warrant.) Anyway, he then should seek the sort of institution where he can subscribe whole-heartedly to the accepted purposes for its being. Or he should join with others in the college community in which he finds himself to develop the purposes and ideals which to him are paramount.

I said a few minutes ago that there is no one sacred purpose to which all institutions should adhere. In a large sense that is not true. Any educational institution worthy of the name seeks to help students to achieve a higher level of integrity, of consideration, and of use of some of their **abilities** than they formerly had known. But when we turn from such lofty concepts, we find diversity of all sorts in American education today.

Those of you who have tried to describe the American educational system to foreigners know how unique our system, or lack of it, is. I have tried - and have been so nearly defeated in an effort to present a brief, general picture of it that I have actually spent hours this winter trying to summarize it in order to be better prepared another time. Consider the college level alone. Describe to a stranger the state universities, explaining the autonomy of each state as against

central government control of education. Add denominational institutions. Then add non-denominational private institutions. Then explain the existence of coeducation, and of separate men's and women's colleges. Try to explain our examination system, our varied admission requirements, the shifting values of degrees. By the time you are through, you and your listener are bewildered and may well be wondering if the diversity is worthwhile, if it wouldn't be better to have a uniform system and devote all energies to making it work.

Yet in the diversity lies our strength. Looked at from society's view - what, above all, do we attribute to the human factor in the strengths evident in America? I am not thinking of the richness of our physical resources, but only of our human resources. Is it not the variety of interest and skill and striving among us? Could we have the physical standards of living, the numbers of spiritual and intellectual freedoms we have, the complex interrelations of agriculture and industry if diversity was not welcome among us? Granted the weaknesses in our economic and social structure, granted the intolerance and hysteria and fear that occasionally sweep over us, there is much tolerance and strength and courage among us as a people, and it stems from the variety among us which we find essential to the way of life which each of us enjoys.

Everyone tells us that education is preparation for life. If so, and if society finds virtue in variety, then in its educational offerings it must prepare for continuing variety. Hence it must demand and respect variety in educational philosophy and method.

So much for society. From the individual's view, the view of the teenager, variety is equally essential. Most of us seem to do our best when we like what we are doing. Some of us know early in life what we like and move directly toward it. But many of us wish to explore before making lasting decisions. So the individual needs to have available various types of institutions, as various professional centers, liberal arts centers, vocational centers, technical, etc., etc., and combinations of them. Moreover, all of us learn best (1) if challenged and put on our mettle and (2) if we have the encouragement of seeing progress in ourselves. So we need also variety in standards in each type of educational institution so that a student can find the right environment for himself - so that, on the one hand, he can avoid progress in laziness which comes when work is too easy and on the other hand can avoid the disintegration of defeat which comes when work is incomprehensible no matter how one strives to master it.

I emphasize thus lengthily the importance of variety because I believe in it as the only means to foster individual development and I stand with those who are more interested in the individual than in the group. I emphasize it also because when one talks of one type of education, one is often misunderstood and charged with thinking that the only important education in the world.

My own interest these days is wholly centered in the liberal arts college, as you can understand. But I hope I have made clear how disastrous I think it would be if the interest of everyone in education was centered in the liberal arts college.

Yet because my thinking is primarily in the area of liberal education in the four-year residential college I wish you would consider with me in the remaining time some of its goals and problems. Students who come to such colleges should be ones who are seeking to free themselves from ignorance, to get outside their moment in time. They should be young people who want to know more of their natural habitat. That takes them to the sciences. They should be young people who seek acquaintance with mankind's ideas and ideals and methods of accomplishment, as individuals and as groups, and that takes them to the arts, to literatures, and social sciences. Through

all of this, they should get training in clear, comprehensive thinking and in how to gather data on which to reflect, in order to reach honest and more valid conclusions. And they should seek all of this for their own benefit and to make themselves more useful in serving their fellows.

It seems to me that a college that has quite different purposes may be equally worthy and important to society, but it is not a liberal arts college.

Even within the group of colleges which do espouse liberal arts there is vast diversity. To meet varying needs, some combine liberal and vocational education; some offer only the one. And the colleges have differing student bodies - some colleges admit only students with superior intellectual ability and good schooling; others take students with good, but not superior ability, and properly, their programs vary accordingly. At Wellesley, for instance, we have chosen as our area education through the liberal arts of unusually able young women. To offer satisfactory challenge to such young women, we must have very strong intellectual offerings. Hence for us the core of the whole is the academic work. If it were not for the academic work we offer, we would not be in existence.

But academic work cannot go far in a vacuum. The intellect cannot be neatly separated from the body and the emotions and the spirit. Hence what may seem at first glance peripheral - physical education, religious education, social education, health education are all necessary elements to the growth of an individual whose primary concern may be with things intellectual. I have met people frail in body and strong in mind, and people painfully shy with their fellows yet bold in creative thought. In general, however, I think we would agree that a healthy mind tends to accompany a healthy body, and that the healthy mind and the healthy body are not goals in themselves but are means whereby the individual improves his chances to use fully his native endowment.

I have been speaking to you as educators concerned with the whole broad picture of education. I confess that I do not like speaking to groups of people, especially to faculty members like you who know more than I about my subject. I shy away from such assignments as often as possible. Yet I am very glad that your committee invited me to join you in this particular year. Everyone of you has in mind today the fact that one year from now Wellesley College plans to discontinue professional training in hygiene and physical education. This is not the place to discuss it in detail, and yet I would not miss this opportunity to stress two points.

Opportunity for undergraduates to have physical education will continue at Wellesley, so far as I can see, as long as the institution exists, right along with opportunity for academic education. Having won its proper place as an important element in every type and on every level of education, physical education need not worry about status. As time passes, I hope that at Wellesley and everywhere else leaders will increasingly stress what they have in recent years - the joy of exercise, the fun in skilled activity. In an earlier agrarian society everyone perforce exercised, though not necessarily in a most healthful way. As urban centers grew, exercise was less necessary to the daily work, and society needed the steady leadership of professional educators to make sure that the race would stay physically strong. We still need that, but in many of us today the duty of using our bodies wisely has been inculcated. Some of us need now, I think, to recall the joy of exercise and, for example, unashamedly play golf or climb a mountain, simply because we like it, caring for precision of skill, not as an end in itself, but as we find our pleasure increasing as our efficiency grows. At the same time, we must at all costs maintain those high standards of sportsmanship which have motivated members of our department and I feel sure of the colleges where all of you are.

I would also emphasize that Wellesley believes as, so far as I know, all colleges do, in the necessity in American education of professional schools of physical education. Through the generations it will count on them to supply the leadership for its physical education programs. This college is proud that it has helped to gain for the profession its rightful place in the academic world; it is proud of the work its alumnae have done and are doing in the field. It will continue to be proud of them. It will regret that it cannot continue to serve the profession directly by carrying on professional education along with its liberal arts curriculum.

But it will strive, by the best lights it has, to be ever mindful of its relation to all other types of education essential to our people, while doing its utmost in the areas where it believes it can most fully serve. It will seek to cooperate with other institutions that the total educational resources of this land which are limited in terms of cash and able teachers may be used most effectively, to the end that variety of excellent educational opportunity shall persist and that as many of our young people as possible can have opportunity to get as much education and training as they wish in whatever are the fields of their abilities and interests.

INTRODUCTION OF DR. LILLIAN GILBRETH

Dr. Lillian Gilbreth is an industrial engineer but is primarily interested in human engineering. She is a graduate of the University of California and received the Ph.D. degree from Brown University as well as a Doctor of Engineering degree from Rutgers University; in addition, she has received honorary degrees from Russell Sage College, University of California, and Smith College. Dr. Gilbreth is an author of books and articles on management in industry and the home and also on the handicapped and disabled. Her work in motion and time studies and studies of fatigue are known the world over.

Dr. Gilbreth's interest in physical education is known to many of us through the talks she has given at Physical Education Conferences including the first International Congress in Physical Education for Girls and Women held in Copenhagen, Denmark in the summer of 1949.

Dr. Gilbreth is not only active as a student, writer, and speaker but at present she is President of Gilbreth Inc., Consulting Engineers. It is a real privilege to present Dr. Gilbreth to you; Dr. Gilbreth.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIETY TODAY AND ITS
CHALLENGE TO EDUCATION

DR. LILLIAN GILBRETH

Madame Chairman, Members of the Conference. It is a very great pleasure and privilege for me to be here with you today. I feel that my talk is primarily to raise questions and not to answer questions. So I am going to put a very large part of it in question form hoping that some of the questions you may answer here and now and the rest of them you can probably be relied upon to answer later. The Chairman is quite right in saying that I have a wonderful feeling of friendship and a great feeling of admiration for the men and women in your profession but especially for the women. My admiration expresses itself in a great wish to extend your field of usefulness through tempting you to go into the business and industrial field and other related fields. We in industry need not only to know how to use the tremendous resources of machines and materials which our country gives to us but how to use the even greater resources of the human being. We have been very slow in business and in industry to realize that the way one uses his body is tremendously important and my first query to you is how many of you will come out to help us and how soon will you come?

I have simplified my subject a little and called it "Women's Job Today" with some implication of problems of education and training. It seems that most of the problems that face us, face men and women alike! Therefore I am going to try to emphasize first of all the problems facing everyone, men and women alike, - then a little about the special responsibilities that women have.

I shall not be able, I am sure, to discover all of the problems there are and you may not agree with me in the ones I mention. Some of the things that we hope to bring out in the discussion period are what these special responsibilities might be, because they are sure to have an implication in every field of education and training. My first question then is what primarily is our job? It seems to me that we often go off into discussing how to do the job before we know what it is. I am inclined to think that our job is service and that we can look at our individual activities or our group activities as service jobs and we can look at our education and training as getting us ready for better service.

We all nowadays believe in group activities and you with your teamwork and your interest in group activity have given leadership in this whole field. You discovered group interaction long before people in many other areas of education and life discovered it. You realize also that not only is group activity a wonderful thing but that the group in its final analysis is made up of individuals. If one starts in to think of "the group" without thinking of individuals in terms of the likenesses between them all and at the same time of the differences between them all and if one fails to consider the importance of likenesses in banishing discrimination of all sorts and the significance of differences in bringing out the dignity of human beings and of the individual, one is not ready to deal with a group. In thinking these things through, it is possible to go into group activities but not before.

What then do you expect of the individual if he or she is going to be of service in the total group? Whether one happens to be in the field of physical education or not, I am almost sure that one would, in the first place, start with physical adequacy and I think it is rather a compliment to you that that is the

case. There is more and more realization of the validity of the idea of a sound mind in a sound body; one therefore must think of this sound body constantly. One must think of what a sound body means in keeping the mind sound or the opposite. It is most important to think, too, of the partnership, the team work, that goes on between people concerned in these areas to keep this idea of the sound body, the well-functioning body, the fit body in the forefront of the picture.

You and I know that this has not really anything to do with disablement of any sort in the sense of being limited only to problems of rehabilitation even though through the efforts of the people in the physical therapies along with the other people who work in these fields it has become possible for many of the physically handicapped to have fitness and to face life with courage and adequacy because they have become physically fit and to experience joy in living as well. The need for a sound body is a general need, however, not limited only to those who have experienced physical misfortunes.

Recently, I was in Fort Travis in California because I am greatly interested in flight nursing. I sometimes think flight nurses have the greatest responsibility and the proudest opportunity of any women in the whole world. I wanted to make sure of course that everything was being done that could be done for the comfort of the patient, for after all these boys coming home in the care of these few women are the center of the whole activity. I wanted to try too, however, if I could to see what could be done for flight nurses themselves.

I went to Fort Travis to observe what was being done as the boys came in to the continental USA. Although there was no plane coming in at the time, there was a plane being serviced and I went over to see that. Then, I went with the nurses and the others into the ward where the returned boys were. They were very young; all crew hair cuts; all very lively. Most of the ones I saw had arm injuries or leg injuries. They were all very nicely done up and were having a beautiful time.

I asked what happened when they arrived. The first thing they wanted was a long distance call home, compliments of the Red Cross. The second thing they wanted was television, also compliments of all of us through the Red Cross. But the third thing that they wanted was a wheel chair whether they needed it or not. They just scurried all over the place in those wheel chairs having a most happy time. Being an addict of efficiency, I suggested we put little motors on the wheel chairs, only to be discouraged by the nurses who said that nobody could keep up with them now and what would happen if they really got motors on them? I think also that the nurses had an idea that the physical activities involved as part of the existing procedure might be a good thing.

It was very interesting to me to see that these young men in their rehabilitation, I felt very sure, reflected the necessary triple emphasis first on the emotional and the social side of their nature in keeping in touch with their own people; second in this fine contact they had made with the life of America through that maligned but valuable new device, television; and third on being able under their own power to get around and to get everything done which they possibly could.

I do not need to tell you, I am sure, that most people on your own faculty and most people throughout the country really have no idea of the breadth of what you are doing or of the potential, the capacity, within your group. You see on every campus, at every meeting, and in your own program here at this meeting an emphasis on sociology, on psychology, on anthropology, on physiology. How many

people really know about your work in body mechanics? How many people know how you take and apply and bring to the individual and the group the findings in many other sciences? You utilize them as research resources and I think it is highly creditable that you draw from all valuable sources. Valuable as your recreation work is and everything that is in that sphere, what joy can there come at the recreation period if people have not learned to use their bodies adequately in every phase of their lives? Your coordination of many fields for the benefit of the individual is outstanding.

That is a point which is very near to my heart, which I hope is very near to yours too so that you will work out not only a better and simpler explanation of your part in the whole educational training system but will demonstrate that you should be a part of the team who are working on rehabilitation of all sorts everywhere all along the line.

In the second place, of course, after physical fitness what we think about next has to do with the individual's mental alertness and capacity. I think that more and more we are coming to realize that while achievement is a wonderful thing, capacity is the thing that counts and along with capacity must come motivation.

As I go from one college to another and as I also meet the young men and women of the country after they are out and settled in their work, I feel, and I know that their faculties feel too, that most of them are not utilizing their full capacities. During their years of college, through your help and the help of all the other people who have been in contact with them one way or another, the students have at their finger tips, but usually have not chosen to use it, some information as to their own capacities and their interests and their possibilities, but they begin to lapse on the job and it is so easy to lapse, really.

I think one of the difficulties at this point is that we have not come to realize yet in this or any other field that education and training are continuous processes starting at the very beginning of one's life and continuing just as long as one has interest to continue.

Many groups out in business and industry feel that we in education are not looking at the whole of life as subject to the educational process. We are really not thinking about what we could delegate back to the home and the kindergarten and the primary school and the secondary school and so on and what we could positively leave for later periods in life when perhaps the individual's interest and motivation would have been developed to deal with the new learnings.

Take the men, all the way from top executives down the line in every sort of business and industry who are going to all parts of the country this summer to supplement what they have previously learned. Some of them it is true stopped below the college level but many of them have college degrees, professional degrees, all sorts of higher degrees with no feeling that any degree or any appointment is an end to their educational development. In the business and industrial world there is a feeling that probably every promotion or change or expansion of work definitely means that there is need for a training period. Whether it is best to train on the job or whether it is better to concentrate while on the job and go off for short training periods or whether one should definitely leave the job for a long interval, business and industry just do not know.

I found top executives in San Francisco going two afternoon a week to a nearby college, because by afternoon they have their work all organized and can leave. On the Stanford campus they are going down to two or three months. At

Harvard, there is a much longer period. I found them at Rock Island Arsenal, the military people and civilian people, there for a two or three weeks training period and so it goes. So I ask of you in your profession and in your kind of work, think of education as being a continuous performance.

I feel that when we come to that realization, when every child is born with society having the idea that his education and training is going to go on continuously, we may have a different attitude as to what we put in or what we leave out somewhere along the line. We may delay at very early stages the introduction to a good many skills not only because they can be acquired and used during a longer period but also because the motivation to learn them may be there much more vividly later on. Psychologists have tried for years to tell us just exactly when various periods of interest do appear. I still think that they may come at different ages and times and under different circumstances for different people. I see many examples not only of young women who know nothing about homemaking and housekeeping diving in and learning a great deal in a short time but I have seen a great many older women who did not happen to marry and set up family life go through the same process of learning not only skills of housekeeping but with great ardor and devotion, skills in family relations.

For instance, how to be a good grandmother really has quite a few problems in its own right which those of us who have faced it 24 times, as I have, can testify. If it takes a good deal of capacity and interest and motivation for us, it must demand a tremendous amount of motivation and capacity from a woman who does not go through the usual stages of being a mother in the situation before taking on the grandmother's sort of function. However, it is always to be said that there are a great many women who do not happen to have married who are the devoted aunts and who really put the family through all the critical areas who may make even better "grandmothers" so far as family relations and helpfulness is concerned than those of us who have gone the easiest way of taking it a day at a time. At any rate, I feel very strongly that continued learning is a challenging problem when it comes to this whole field of the measurement of and the utilization of our capacities and of motivation.

We have found in business and industry, and I just bring it to you as something that has happened to us, that we have made some serious mistakes but I think we are trying to better our performance. As an example, we find that we thought we were smart when we used people on jobs which did not require their high skills most of the time whether they liked the job or not. I can remember very well a personnel man or an employment man who got someone who definitely was too good for the job and thought that he got a bargain. We have learned that that is not true. Such people will do one of two things: they will either get tired of the job, and there will be a tremendous turn-over or they will bog down on the job or even sink below it and at once there is a serious problem for the worker with every groove into which he sinks. That sort of an experience one passes on to you and asks you, "How can we do more to make people have an opportunity to use more of their higher skills more of the time?" Some people would say, "Why do you ask that of a physical education group?" And I say I ask it very definitely because I feel that you have an answer.

When much of the new materials connected with psychology, and what not, came into the field, many of us were tempted to rush in far over our depth. We saw all sorts of emotional, difficult problems in our children and in our workers and in our colleagues, in fact in everybody but our-

selves. Such a thing is very easy to do. Then all of a sudden we woke up to the fact that maybe if we checked on some of the physical problems, some of the clinical ones in the psychological sense might disappear and really a good many of them did. Having tried them in family and work relationships, I feel very sure that that is true and all this new thinking in psychosomatics whether it affects medicine or any other field is something that has to be a very close part of our thinking.

This leads us quite naturally into the emotional aspects of a job and the emotional capacity and adaptability of the people who do these jobs. We have learned much more about the physical demands of the jobs than we knew. We have learned also that it is very shortsighted really for someone who has nothing but work simplification to try to simplify the job without the cooperation of the people in your field. Very often if a person had used her body properly at her work in the first place many of the problems which we have faced would not have happened at all. I feel sure also that we are going to be able to use you, with your cooperation, in the manufacture of machines and equipment no matter where that equipment or machinery goes, -- into the factory, into the office or into the home.

Just about a week ago I was in the Rock Island Arsenal. There there is a tremendous number of women, and many of them are doing very heavy work, doing it by preference. There is a great pride in their hearts that they can do this sort of thing. Invariably the little women come in and want to run the biggest machines there are. I suppose it gives them a sense of power or satisfaction or something along those lines. I feel sure by work simplification we can do a lot to lighten work. I feel sure that in many cases it would be unwise to do so unless we can develop the teamwork I am talking about where we could look at the job and see what the demands are on the human being and what you think they ought to be from the standpoint of using the body to the greatest advantage. Then we could bring in our placing of materials, our choice of machines and equipment, our methods so that our ideas and your ideas could be fused

When it comes to questions of social adjustment, again I feel that you have a great deal to contribute. You doubtless know the practical experiments on lighting that were conducted by the Western Electric Company. They put the lights up and up, and the work went up and up and up; and they let the lights go down and the work went up; and finally they found that, while lighting had something to do with it, team work was the thing that counts, that team work in its many aspects was tremendously important. In the first place, they found that people like each other and want to work with each other, and in the second place they found that when women were allowed freedom in chatting and in giving their opinions their feeling of being important members of teams was increased, whereupon their work output substantially increased.

When people talk to me about the fine things you do in recreation and how happy they make the worker and how he enjoys the various sorts of activities, they so seldom seem to realize that it is not only because recreation takes them out of doors in industry and business and gives them activity and that sort of thing but also it does give them this feeling of teamwork and participating in groups. We want to carry that same spirit into the work period if we possibly can and it is our hope that you will help us and go along in that endeavor.

The next thing besides the individual job that each of us has to do, I think, is the job in the family and in the home. Increasingly we are feeling that everybody is a part of a family unit, all her life wherever she may go and whatever she may do, in fact not only through this life but probably, we believe, always. At any rate, we do know that the letter from home, with all the little chit chat of home, which seems a cheap thing, is the most precious thing that anybody can send to a boy overseas. Not only do the boys, the few that I have seen, who are returning from overseas tell me this (and their experiences are just like our own boys during the war only this group is so very young and so very vulnerable) but also the mothers of these boys tell me that letters from home mean so very much. Invariably the letters coming back say "Gee, Mom, it's good to get your letters. Just tell me about every minute of every day because that is what I want to know about." Many of the young soldiers feel almost closer to their homes and their people and their town and their environment through these letters than they do when they are in their home towns.

We have that sort of thing to keep in mind in whatever we are doing. The continuity of the process is vividly apparent in family relationships. Again, let me say, I believe we must constantly think about this whole matter of education and training all through the years. Based on their urgent experience, business and industry are saying to themselves and to us in education that when a new problem comes there should be time taken out for education to insure competency in handling the new problem. You here, and there are a few here who are experts in this field, know that too often a new thing is taken on without provision being made for time for acquiring the new sort of functioning or any thought given to the readjustment entailed in going over into the new activity. People feel swamped, people feel alone, people feel discouraged, and they really would not have to feel any of those things if they only knew somebody would stand by and help them learn.

As an example of constructive procedure, I know what you have done for women to help them go through maternity problems with ease. I think it is an unacknowledged debt owed to your profession. Many women who had never previously had an opportunity for the kind of physical education you could give them, get it at that period and it carries through into subsequent years.

Then there is the talk about the importance of creative activities. How wonderful is this creative activity of bringing children into the world. Of course it is a creative activity in the best sense if it is really well-done and easily done and done with pleasure and done so that you go on with your later life feeling that you have enriched your life in every way and are not restricted in what you are doing. Many women have profited in these ways because people like yourselves representing your profession, and others who have been a part of the team, have carried through such desirable, continued service to adults.

I think, however that there has been a little falling down somewhere along the line in helping the young homemaker and mother face all the responsibilities which come along during the child rearing period when one's house-keeping and one's children seem to make such tremendous demands upon one that one feels that one is shut off and restricted from almost anything else. It is all very well for us to say that we will send somebody in from the Women's Club to release the young mother for some other activity. Try to get someone from the women's club to think she would like to sit with the children. Then get someone to take her to her job in a car at the time the club offers the homemaker activity. Then your mother says, "I'm just too tired to go." There is something wrong somewhere.

We all know that it is the old story that you have to help the homemaker from every standpoint to feel able and fit and ready to carry on. I bring this again to you, not as a criticism, but as a question. Is it possible to think your work through all the way along the line.

Later there comes this terrible period to every young man and woman when their capacity to work begins to diminish a little. If you are intelligent you immediately withdraw from public gaze until you have worked out a technique for going ahead. But surely if at any time in a person's life she really needs a helping hand, it is in that period. Thank heaven and you, we have done away with fear of the menopause. Thanks to common sense we have come to the point where it is no longer smart to be ailing and instead of feeling sorry for people who cannot keep up with their programs, we just feel sorry they are such poor program planners, and there you are.

And I am wondering too, what you can do for the older people who are retired, and who are so desperately unwilling to be retired. Now in the first place, I know that one tends to suggest a change in pace. But one can always say that is what one has to suggest to a good many people anyway. No matter what their age is, one slows some down and peps some up, and one goes around trying to help them fit in in the light of their opportunities. There must be some special way in which physical educators can cooperate in this whole project.

Another group we in work simplification have a lot of difficulty with are the overweight people who should have a good deal of activity who just joyfully take all our work simplification, love to sit instead of stand, stand instead of walk, are delighted just to cut out every possible bit of activity. You should come in and say, "Now see here, you don't want to put these things down; you pick them up." You do not want to put things low down in the way you would for a heart condition or an incipient T.B. case (or the equivalent, convenient in any case). These people need to lean over and if you do not want them to bend at the waist (and this is a great contribution you have made in the work of the disabled heart and the T.B. people), why, they can bend their knees.

It is good to have you come in and interpret for every women what the doctor means when he says, "This you can do, this you can't do, this you can eat, and this you shouldn't eat etc." Why shouldn't you physical educators be right there and say, "O. K., here are the doctor's orders and here are the dietician's orders, here are instructions or helps or aids (or whatever the physical educators may have), as to how you can do this sort of thing and get the right kind of activity for you or avoid activity if that is the answer." There is not time to explore that angle any longer, because I want to say a few words in three other areas.

One other area has to do with the citizen's job. We all share that job. We all know that we have responsibilities as citizens in the first place, and some of us, responsibilities to run for high office. Running for office is a horrible job in this country with the mud throwing and lack of appreciation and destructive criticism that takes place. Many of us are needed to work down the line, and all of us to work in our parties whatever they may be, and everybody to vote and to assume whatever responsibility is wanted; hospital boards, school boards, Red Cross and what not. But there again it seems to me there may be certain definite things that you and your group can do, not only to stimulate activity, but also to give some very direct help in conducting the activity.

We, in work simplification, think we can help if a woman says, "Well, where am I going to get the time to do this?" We can say, "In the first place, eliminate what does not need to be done." One thinks one has an answer there but one only has a question, because then one is in for an all night talk on what the woman thinks needs to be done and one probably does not agree with her. Next we may say, "Economize on your energy." That is a point where we very definitely need you as a part of the picture. In fact, I have a feeling that wherever energy comes into the job at all, there is a very definite job for you.

And of course, one need not say that you share with all the rest of us the need to appreciate the people who do go into public life. I think the woman who steps out and goes into a citizenship job often has a very hard road, too hard. And it is not because she is not made welcome or appreciated or given an opportunity by men. Very often it is because she does not have the real wholehearted support of other women. That means a very great deal.

Then second, there is the volunteer's job. Personally, I am more interested in the volunteer spirit than I am in the volunteer job, because I think we could cure a good many problems today if more of the volunteer spirit came in. There needs to be more talk of the spirit than of the letter and the contract. For example, I was in a home not long ago where for years on end the man of the family, a professional man, has come home and done the dishes every night since they have not had maids, and that is a good long time in most American homes. There was no agreement that he would do this. His wife does a lot of community work, but she does not have a paid job. Her community work and her home responsibilities have a lot of activity in them. His work happens to be more or less a sedentary job. He comes home at night and physically it is really very good for him to do this job. I wondered how she persuaded him to do it. Well, she said she never did persuade him; he offered. But she said she never forgot for one day that it was a voluntary activity on his part and every single night she said "Thank you dear, you didn't have to do it, and I do appreciate that you took it over." After some twenty odd years of married life he might have got a little tired of the phraseology, but he did not. Apparently he ate it up with great satisfaction, and I can see that he gave with great satisfaction. I cannot swear that the appreciation was stated in the same language every time, but I am just wondering if that same giving of volunteer activity and the appreciation of volunteer activity is not really a part of many more successful doings of jobs than we think.

I fear the volunteer spirit has fallen out of business and industry, and that is the difficulty. There is the woman who comes in just on time, clocks in, and then takes company time to get herself ready for the day and stretches every rest period and just lives up to the letter of the law to the point where nobody can exactly pin anything on her. And she looks so disgruntled when she has to stay over a minute. She definitely is not showing the volunteer spirit.

You have no idea the difficulty that civilian attitude is causing in the armed services. Our girls go to the service giving up home life and a tremendous number of things, as those of you who have been in the armed service know that they do. I went into a Pentagon office the other day where all the women were in uniform, army air corps, army nurse, and what not, except for one girl in the office in a summer print, with lots of pretty costume jewelry. None of the women in the services said a single word, but they all looked at her and I knew there really was a sacrifice there. Those women in the armed services do whatever job has to be done, whether it takes their kind of skill or not. They stay there whether they want to or not. They work overtime

whether they want to or not. I do not say they do not want to, I think they do want to, but they work round the clock if they have to, as, for instance, flight nurses do. It seems to me that a realization of that sacrifice and an acknowledgment of the volunteer spirit, should be more evident.

I know how many of you do volunteer jobs. I have had occasion to see you do them. I have seen you coming into the Red Cross or the Girl Scouts or any other activity and take over either as a professional or as a volunteer worker. I think sometimes the professionals in those fields are the finest volunteers of all, because surely so far as any material gain is concerned, like teaching, being a librarian or a curator in a museum, it is not for the material gain that you go in to such work; it is for the kind of service you can do.

Then third we come to the paid job. I think we can take it for granted that you and I feel that every woman should have the training and the opportunity and economic satisfaction of being on a paid job at some time in her life. First, because it does give a certain amount of economic security, second, because it demonstrates to the world that she can do the work.

One disgusting phrase abroad in the world is, "I'm only a housewife." Now if we can, by any possibility, help to eradicate that attitude by having all other women holding paying jobs, compare what they do in terms of spiritual and material values with what a housewife does, then perhaps we have gotten somewhere. However, perhaps women do need more understanding of what you and I, many of whom have been wage earners all our lives have for assets and liabilities in our daily experience. When you go to work in the morning, you see the housewife standing in the window looking out, and you know what she is thinking, "Lucky you," or "Lucky me". She thinks that we, as paid workers, can just put on clothes and go trotting to town; we can have exciting adventures all day long, we can meet interesting people, do jobs which are varied, and in the evening we can probably have a very fascinating date, and on weekends we can do just nothing but lie in the sun and rest. And we have definite holiday times and what not. At the same time we look in the windows at the homemaker and we think, "Lucky you"; you didn't have to get up at any set hour; you didn't have to put on city clothes; you don't know how disagreeably competitive our work can be; you don't know how many disappointments can occur; and you don't know that, while it is true that now and then some wonderful break can come and some excitement appear, by and large there are substantial liabilities as well as assets in our field too." I think if we could do a good deal of shifting about now and then and trying each other's jobs, that might be an interesting experience.

I want to touch upon two or three further problems that seem important in every area of life and get your reactions to what your group could do with them too. In the first place, the world says to us, "Does American industry and business pay any attention to anything but material values? What thought do you have of spiritual values, and of the beauty that there can be in life, of the beauty of human relations?" Well, I suppose we took it for granted that when we sent groups over seas to carry machines and money and help of every sort that our emissaries could not make any of those things work out without fine human relations. If we had not felt warm and friendly and wanted to build up human relations we just would not have gone. I wonder in your own groups, as I wonder in mine, if we always test our people going over seas to make sure that they do have, not only the technical skills and know-how, the famous American know-how which is going all over the world, but also this feeling for friendly, warm human relations. If too many of them lack this human attitude, perhaps that contributes to the complaint about us I have just spoken of.

It seems to me that we have been unduly slow to recognize the advantage of men and women whose parents came from over seas, who were brought up in homes where there were two integrated loyalties, loyalty to the country from which they came and loyalty to the country to which they had gone. Yet we know these groups exist all over the country. When I find a group going over seas in which it may be that not one man or woman, except the interpreter, knows any of the language of the country, the customs of the country, the feeling of the country, the urges and well springs of energy and motivation in the country, I just do not feel we have used our human resources to the greatest degree, especially if these people are rather cold and professional and remote every moment. That is why I think it is so fine that a group like this belongs to an international group, that you go to international meetings, that a few of you can and will weave a web of friendship back and forth across the ocean. Perhaps it is a sometimes unappreciated contribution that nevertheless does seem to me to be very real and very rare, and that it does fall into the category of spiritual and non-material values that people ask us about.

A second question the world asks us is, are we making what we have available to everybody from the top down, or from the bottom up, as you please to call it? In industry, we find we have been very negligent of top management. We have not realized that top management has time and energy problems, and money problems, and all other sorts of problems. They seem so high up and so well endowed, and have such power that we think they have everything. Well they do not have. Their problems are very real, and as I have said before, their need for information is very great. Now, we in industry have made some bad mistakes. In the first place, we have talked about "refresher" courses, and a good many of us know that there is mighty little to refresh. The fact that you may be at the top of the enterprise does not mean that of necessity you know all about everything; probably you do not. I think also we have failed to realize that the higher up you get, probably the more important face-saving becomes. Now face-saving is a very complicated thing. Top management, for example, goes to lunch with other top management. The first man says, "We're making new advances." It might be that, "We are putting in -----." I hope it will be, "We're putting in body mechanics and physical education in our place, and we think it is wonderful. How do you get along with yours?" The second man hesitates, he does not know quite what it is, and certainly does not know where he could get it and he says, "Well, I have to check, and we can talk at lunch another time." And he goes back and he calls in everybody and he says, "What is this thing that is going on? Why haven't you done anything about it?" You may not think it is important that top management knows about your contribution. I had a student once who was quite the most brilliant man I ever had in work simplification. When he got through his training he went to work. At the end of a month he called me and said "I'm stymied, I can't do a thing." I thought and thought and finally I remembered that the very top man of this company happened to be a person I had known as a neighbor once upon a time. I wrote the neighbor a little note and said, "It is a long time since I have seen you. I am so interested to find that a man you have taken in your company is the best student I have had. How do you feel he is getting on?" The next morning after the executive got the letter, my man called me from his plant and said, "I don't know what happened but every door is open and everybody wants to know 'What have you done? Do something quickly, because the boss wants to know'."

The third thing I want to mention is serenity of spirit. If one tries to evaluate the varieties of services that could be rendered in this world today, I think the contribution of serenity of spirit might be perhaps the greatest thing that could be offered. I have always been fond of thinking that sometimes the greatest contribution to family life is the baby. If it is well born and well bred a

brought up with enough freedom and with just enough control so it is not a pest, it is apt to induce serenity of spirit into the atmosphere. I often think also that serenity could be the contribution of a fine grandparent. I have not tried it out as yet, but I have had plenty of opportunity, heaven knows, with twelve grandsons and twelve granddaughters, running from little ones all over the country to big ones getting out of school, but I still believe that it is a great contribution. I want to pay you a real compliment when I tell you that I do think that you have made great contributions in that field. We want a sound mind and sound body, but we want a serene spirit in that body. I do not know whether it is because you do, perhaps, spend more time than most of us in the open air that you have acquired serenity from admiring nature. When one has come to admire the things that are beautiful, in the sky, in the air, in the woods, in the sea or under the sea, I feel sure one has achieved serenity of spirit. I think such serenity does come from the beautiful in every field. In San Francisco at the Matisse exhibit, I saw men, women and children spending hours looking at those lovely paintings. Perhaps what they got from them is all that I myself really am capable of getting, that is, a greater appreciation of nature when I go out and see it through the eyes of an artist. Consider what music does for people; observe what poetry does for people. You and I have not, in this short time, even spoken about a liberal education, because I am sure we agree that no matter what the life work of a person is or what the skills that any field requires, one must build on a liberal education and one must have opportunities to add to that education all of the time.

Consider poets. I love to think of what the poets have done for you and me. We draw on Whittier and the barefoot boy and the little toy dog, and so on, not perhaps the great poets of the world in every case, but the little ones Longfellow talks about. Then I think about Portia and the quality of mercy which is not strained. Shakespeare shows an executive and a fine woman out on her job. Then you come to the lovely passage in Browning's "Prospice" where he says, "Then a light, then thy breast,--Oh thou soul of my soul! I shall clasp thee again,--And with God be the rest!" It is unthinkable that we should send our boys and girls and our men and women into life without that beautiful experience. I have a feeling that serenity of spirit perhaps is what they are looking for most. I do not mean necessarily quietude. As has been said, "Serene I fold my hands and wait." I suppose that is the idea of Whistler's mother, but I think it might also be said, "Serene I use my hands and wait."

OPEN FORUM DISCUSSION

(Following address by Dr. Gilbreth)

QUESTION: Are there studies of movement in use in time motion studies which could be recommended to us?

ANSWER: I am sorry to say that I think most people in the business and industry know very little about any types of studies which have been made. I think the only way they are going to become acquainted with them really is when they are presented to them by somebody who knows and understands the industrial situation. It is an odd thing, but they seem absolutely unable to follow case material unless it is in their own area. And I have been in this dilemma all through the years of trying to persuade business men that they needed people trained in this field to come in and work along with them in the work simplification field. They say, "Well, you bring some people in and we'll interview them." I then go back to the other group at the colleges and schools and ask, "Could we have some people who are ready to come?" and then by the time they find someone, business has gone off on another deal.

Now I think the only thing we can do is try to get a few women, because I think we need women, to be willing to do the equivalent of an internship in order to know what the workers problems are, etc. I can give you just one experience you may know about where we had wonderful results. It was in a small industry making things for the Navy where we took on a lot of women as workers. They did a lot of standing and heavy work using muscles not ordinarily used or not used to the extent now needed. The absenteeism and drop off was very high. We finally persuaded a physical education man, we couldn't find a woman, to take part time off to come to us. He set up a body mechanics program. He talked with the women, he found out what they had done and he found out what they had to do. He worked out exercises for them, with the result that graphs showed that the absenteeism and drop-out went constantly down. When the war was over, the women left, and of course the project was dropped.

I think this time not the war but production is bringing people in to industry. I was telling my lunch companions this noon that at the Rock Island arsenal, management thought very favorably about having a women come on the staff not only to work with the work simplification people in the trades but to go out and study women on the job. If we could get one woman to do one job and have case material with some films, we could certainly sell our idea to industry.

QUESTION: If we are interested in this type of project, how should we go about getting into the field? Through Dr. Gilbreth, through a neighborhood industry or how?

ANSWER: I would say through every medium you possibly can find. In the first place, if in your trips abroad or in this country you see any of this type of study going on or if in your own work you know of any research in this field, I would be very glad to relay it on to the work simplification group. In the second place, I do think that if any of you could interest neighboring industries, that would be wonderful. The little experimentation that went on during the war was done by men and I feel very, very distinctly that it is a job for women.

QUESTION: How does one curtail her energies when she feels she wishes to use her full capacity for complete satisfaction of each task when there are many different tasks she is responsible for?

ANSWER: It seems to me that there might be a conflict between quantity working and quality working but I am not sure whether the person asking that question meant that or not. I do think that people who have a great deal of quality work

suffer very much on the job and can't do justice to the thing concerned. I really think it becomes a matter of tension. It becomes a matter of setting one's life up in such a way that there is time to do completely and well the thing needing to be done. On the other hand, I feel sure that people who have the quantity urge are equally distressed by having to deal with what they might consider an almost over-perfectionist attitude. It is one of the questions we try very hard to put to personnel people, the fact that they should try to find out whether the people like quality work or quantity work. I happen to be a quantity person but I have great respect and admiration for the quality people; in the right place they are a priceless boon; in the wrong place they are rather a pest. When you want a thing done very, very quickly and should not bother to correct errors if it is wrong, not only does the quality person suffer excruciating pains, I am sure, but the quantity person suffers when the quality worker comes in and says, "I just couldn't do it that way, it took me longer than I thought but see how beautiful it is!"

In other words, it is essential to decide which of one's daily responsibilities demand quantity work and which demand quality work and act accordingly.

QUESTION: I wonder if there is any danger these days when we know the world is getting so mechanized of over-doing this simplification of work? Whether possibly instead of using our muscles more efficiently as the work simplification people would have us do, perhaps we may be failing to use them enough, even if we are using them efficiently?

ANSWER: In the first place, the age of mechanization is with us to stay. The most interesting people we had in Canada at the Engineering Institute say the push-button era is under way; mechanization is coming more and more. The young engineer who wrote the most revealing paper quoted from an enormous body of literature. His position was that appropriate mechanization frees more and more people from repetitive drudgery and other dull kinds of work and that it calls for the workers who do remain in the industrial and business field to have a higher type of training in order to coordinate and manage all the mechanical devices. He felt, of course, also, that although a lot of work in industry may have an interest for people who like competitive work (and there are people who love competitive work, by the way, and are perfectly happy on it), by and large modern methods give more time for creative activity, not primarily for money returns but for satisfaction in living.

Now, I think that if some people would prefer more simple activity on their work jobs that they should be considered. Especially do I think this is true of the homemaker. Doris Anderson developed a work simplification method of dusting two banisters by putting two dusting mitts on two hands, not only would it dust two banisters at once, but the motion of going up and down and so on was well balanced motion. When it comes to work in the home, that is a matter for home economics, for physical education, and for work simplification to work together on. Of course, we finally hope that some day every child will have an idea of the resources in these fields and will get intelligent help in what he is doing.

I think most people in industry, if they could get the financial return they needed to lead a full life, would prefer shorter work hours with all the dull requirements of energy cut out in order to spend the time out of doors, and I think most homemakers would too, but I have had some of them say to me, mostly older homemakers, that they wanted to take all their time and spend all their energy in the home, I think they almost made a fetish of the fact that it took them all their time to do their housework and that they wanted it to take all their time and that they more or less justified their existence in being bound to their homes. They represent a challenge for education to equip them with worthwhile recreational skills and attitudes.

DISCUSSION GROUPS

(Following Address by Dr. Gilbreth)

General Education Group

1. How can physical education promote a further realization and understanding of movement as it contributes to self-realization on the part of the worker, citizen, wife, mother?
2. How can our program of physical education help to teach girls to conserve energy and develop endurance in the execution of routine tasks of adulthood?
3. How can we use the arts, especially dance, to develop "serenity of spirit" and appreciation of beauty?
4. How can physical education contribute to the adjustment of women to their ever-changing roles throughout the life span?
5. How can physical education develop in students a desire and interest in service to others with the "volunteer spirit"?
6. What can be the contribution of physical education to a realization of the need for continuous educational experience into and throughout adulthood?
7. Are we in physical education making the contribution we could in the area of health and welfare in business and industry?

Teacher Education Group

Many teacher training schools are actively concerned with pupil orientation. Some carry the idea further and provide for faculty and subject orientation.

Methods used are: pre-school three day orientation, a faculty day, 6 departments each give a demonstration, followed by a panel discussion of correlation.

Before start of practice teaching, High School teachers give demonstrations of their teaching methods.

Send copies of all reports of curriculum changes to other departments to make them aware of overlapping or of desirable correlations.

Send Seniors out into community for three weeks for job or travel experience (following preliminary guidance)
Prepare students for possible conflicting viewpoints where there is overlapping of subject area in other departments.
Make students aware of common purpose.

History of physical education given briefly in first year, and thoroughly in Senior year.

Practices which lessened discrimination and made for better social and emotional relationships:

Cultural use of folk dancing.

Recreational meetings.

Suggestions regarding the curriculum:

Workshop spring and fall for evaluation and integration
Weekly meetings of three departments; art, music, physical education to report on experiences in school visitations
See that complete outline of all prerequisite courses are in the hands of curriculum committee. (to avoid repetition)

Meeting the problem of foreign speaking students:

Teachers were sent to Puerto Rico to learn the language and absorb the culture. Part of their assignment was to pass on their understanding to other teachers who were unable to go.

Utilize the foreign born to increase the cultural base of our nationals.

TO SUMMARIZE THE SUMMARY:

Keeping in mind the universality of likenesses and differences of people, their need for emotional, social, vocational, and spiritual balance and satisfaction, as educators it is our responsibility to free our students from misconceptions and lead the way to a full rich life. An essential phase of this is economizing our time and energy in the basic acts of living so that we may see our place in the continuity of events and culture, and attain and maintain serenity of spirit through the realization of the usefulness of our volunteer service.

The impact of these ideas stirred the Teacher Training group to suggest many improvements in curriculum construction and correlation. The necessity of orientation and understanding between pupil and teacher, and between departments was stressed.

INTRODUCTION OF DR. MARY ELLEN GOODMAN

Anthropology is one of the sciences with which the majority of us are somewhat unfamiliar. During the undergraduate days of many of us it was not a common discipline on the American campus. Its forms we do not discern; its colors are blurred. But in the thought of a new social science, it seems destined to play a central role as the integrator of those branches of learning which have set out to study man.

During the early days of this century something we may call "scientific anthropology" began to develop, and the number of scholars in the field has increased steadily as the need for a science of man became one of our pressing intellectual and practical needs.

Now as has been said many times, "one of the interesting things about human beings is that they DO try to understand themselves and their own behavior." In a sense of course, this means understanding not only "biological properties, individual experience, and the immediate situation"; it means also an attempt to understand total cultures and cultural patterns particularly. For the pattern is a "structure," as Dr. Kluckholm calls it; it is not an haphazard collection." "The chief claim which can be made for the culture concept as an aid to useful action is that it helps us enormously toward predicting human behavior." And as the fact of "cultural difference" faces us most directly in America today (world becoming smaller and our own social problems more complex and acute), these problems after facts and the implications therefrom assume a most strategic position in the study of mankind.

I have the very great pleasure of presenting to you Dr. Mary Ellen Goodman, Assistant Professor in the Dep't. of Sociology and Anthropology of Wellesley College. Dr. Goodman is a graduate of the University of California at Los Angeles, and so we know that she has caught the length and breadth of America thru personal experience. Her graduate degrees are from Radcliffe College. She is a social or cultural anthropologist, having done important research on racial problems. She is a member of many distinguished professional organizations, including Sigma Xi and Phi Beta Kappa. She has recently published a book titled: Race Awareness in Young Children. Her husband, Dr. Clark Goodman, is a professor of physics at M.I.T.; they have two children.

Now I give you: Dr. Mary Ellen Goodman.
She will speak on the subject:

"An Anthropologist's View of Mid-Century America."

* All quotes from Kluckholm, Clyde: Mirror for Man.

AN ANTHROPOLOGIST'S VIEW OF MID-CENTURY AMERICA

DR. MARY ELLEN GOODMAN

It is the anthropologist's business to learn as much as he can about the human animal. As Yale's great anthropologist, Ralph Linton, has put it, it is the anthropologist's business to learn and teach about "this curious biped and his even more curious behavior." In pursuance of this ambitious goal the anthropologist flits with magnificent abandon through a million years or so of time and no spot on the globe is safe from his spade, his calipers, or his notebook. His craft has been irreverently labelled "the investigation of oddments by the eccentric," but he sees his role today as supplementary and complementary to the various other sciences of man, notably sociology, psychology, economics and political science. Human biology, human pre-history, the range and variety of human ways of life,--these are the major concerns, respectively, of those varieties of anthropologist known as physical anthropologists, archaeologists, and cultural anthropologists.

Cultural anthropologists, until quite recently, concentrated their attentions upon the so-called "primitive" peoples. But now, emboldened by their success in describing and analyzing the ways of life in Samoa, Tibet, the New Hebrides, and innumerable other remote and exotic spots, anthropologists have taken to the notion that nothing need be sacred from their prying and probing. You and I, and our staggeringly complex culture and society, will serve quite as well as the Samoans. And so we have had a series of anthropological studies of American communities, beginning with Middletown in 1928, followed by Middletown in Transition in 1937, and a series of reports on Yankee City, on Southerntown and Plantation County, on Plainville and Jonesville, U.S.A., and more, and the trend is gathering momentum. Not satisfied with community studies, which are quite in keeping with the anthropological tradition of holistic investigation of a given social and cultural unit, our ambitious anthropologists have taken to free-wheeling commentary on the American scene in the large. So we have had Margaret Mead's And Keep Your Powder Dry, Geoffrey Gorer's The American People, as well as numbers of less grandiose attacks upon the American Colossus such as Clyde Kluckhohn's chapter "An Anthropologist Looks at the U.S." in his Mirror for Man.

Lest I begin to make anthropologists sound quite presumptuous let me hasten to add that they usually show a proper humility before the magnitude of such tasks. They know how little they know, as Clyde Kluckhohn points out when he observes that "of this (American) culture in the anthropological sense we know less than of Eskimo culture."

But the cultural anthropologist believes that his knowing a considerable amount about Eskimo culture, and a host of other cultures quite different than the American, gives him a special competence for observing and analyzing the latter. In this age of specialization he has made the study of culture--of the distinctive and patterned life ways of groups of people--his particular specialty. Having supplied a vast amount of data concerning non-American cultures widely distributed through time and space, and enormously varied, he has made it possible for us to get perspective on American culture, and to see ourselves, to some degree, with an Olympian detachment.

This in itself is an achievement of no mean proportions, for Americans are like all other peoples in their propensity for ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism is the tendency to see one's own people and way of life as central, pivotal and superior in the human universe. Ethnocentrism appears in varying degrees in all human societies, and it is productive of an incalculable amount of that

inhumanity of man toward other men which figures so boldly on every page of human history and prehistory. Ethnocentrism springs in large part from ignorance of other peoples--from sheer provincialism--like that of the many tribal groups who are barely aware of the existence of peoples beyond the river or mountain range which bounds their familiar territory. Contemporary tribal peoples are likely to classify mankind as do the tribes of South New Guinea. For these people there are in the world, first of all, the "real humans" i.e. themselves. Neighboring peoples, all less human in varying degrees, are (by time-honored tradition) either friends, enemies, or just plain foreigners (Americans, Chinese, and other non-native peoples). These last may turn out to be either friends or enemies and who are extremely confusing to the native because he lacks a traditional definition of their friend or enemy status. To the anthropologist there is no difference in kind between this naive and narrow view of humanity and a good many of the views common among ourselves in 1952. Americans are, on the average, very much better informed than the New Guinea tribesman about the number and variety of peoples and their places around the globe. But whether the classifications of these other peoples made by the average American is much more sophisticated is open to question. There is the Russian bloc--our "natural" enemies--the NATO nations--our friends (by treaty if not by nature) and the residue of world peoples--India--the Arab bloc--the Latin Americans--and others, whom we regard as "foreigners" or as yet undetermined friend or enemy status and who are consequently regarded with the same wariness and mistrust as the tribesman feels toward non-natives.

We Americans, who pride ourselves on our rationality and our "common sense," of course believe that we have good and sufficient reasons for our classifications, and can advance a host of more or less convincing arguments to back them up. In this we differ from the tribesman only to the degree that we insist upon justifying our ethnocentrism in lofty, moralistic terms, while he is likely to be content with the simple statement that things have always been this way, and with some equally simple and utterly practical reasons. One must have enemies--how else could young men make war, take heads, and hence gain the prestige of the adult male? Conversely, one must have friends--how else insure reasonable safety in relation to one's immediate neighbors and the advantages of trade with the people who know how to make the boats and drums one wants and needs, or in whose forest territory there live the birds of paradise whose feathers one covets?

We are like other peoples in that we react to periods of crisis, of real or fancied threat to the continued existence of our present society and culture, with heightened ethnocentrism. Americans today have a keen sense of world tension and of impending world disaster. We live in mid-century in an "anxious age"--and the symptoms of our anxiety are manifold. Dr. Ruth Cunningham of Columbia University, editor of the recent report on modern education entitled Growing up in an Anxious Age points out that fear is the powerful enemy of that exercise of "blessed reason" in which we, like our Puritan forebears, still fervently believe even while we fail to practice the use of it. "We are frightened," says Dr. Cunningham, "and maybe rightly so, but we can avoid scapegoating, calling names, and all the other damaging things frightened people tend to do." The "super-patriots," the "die-hard isolationists," the "anti-intellectualists" who are the violent attackers of American education, all have become more conspicuous of late. There have always been such elements in American society, but they multiply in crisis times and enhance personal ego and status by playing upon anxiety and ethnocentrism. They manipulate hallowed cultural symbols--the flag, the constitution, "our boys," especially those overseas, our founding fathers, home and mother, the three R's--in such a way as to suggest that he who is not with them is against them, and hence disloyal.

The McCarthys, MacArthurs, and Goslins of our day are intensely traditionalistic--they would restore and revitalize frontier virtues in a society which

has long since conquered its last geographical frontiers. Frontier virtues are no longer appropriate, they are indeed often what Clyde Kluckhohn has called, "the intolerable vices of contemporary America." There are many more subtle and less serious manifestations of a return to traditionalism than we have time to examine here--such as the return to popularity of the folk ballad, square dancing, revivalistic religion, the traditional interior décor, but whatever the manifestations they add up to a phenomenon familiar to the anthropologist--the phenomenon of nativism. Nativism is a determined attempt on the part of tribal leaders, usually self-appointed, to restore ancient practices and beliefs which are falling into limbo under pressure of changed circumstances. In the case of non-literate peoples these changed circumstances are usually brought about by contact with Europeans or Americans. The effects of the contact are usually disastrous and the native peoples, finding themselves over-powered and subjugated, make a last frantic effort to escape by retreating into the vanished past and recreating it by reiterating the time-hallowed symbols of the culture. Unfortunately there is no escape except by a courageous facing forward and a concerted effort to meet the changed circumstances realistically. Nativistic movements never bring more than temporary release of accumulated frustrations. They provide delusion and distraction and leave the participants, as did the Ghost Dance religious nativism of the Sioux Indians some sixty years ago, exhausted and more sunk in despair than when they were caught up in the hysterical crescendo. McCarthyism and kindred American cults differ from the Ghost Dance chiefly in being at least explicitly secular, in keeping with our much more secularized culture.

Like other peoples, Americans demand loyalty to the in-group (most particularly in crisis times) and, in varying degrees, conformity with the standards and values of the community as a whole. We are indeed peculiar in the extent to which we idealize tolerance of deviance and the right of the individual to self-determination. We are in fact peculiar in the degree to which we idealize, and romanticize, the individual and intend not only to free him from constraint and compulsion but also to demand that he "stand on his own two feet," make the most of his individual potentialities, and make his own way in the world. Anthropologists will generally agree with the fundamental soundness of the individualistic ideal, for anthropologists are intensely aware of the extent to which society can be impoverished when its individual members are prevented from the development and exercise of their capacities. Correlatively, anthropologists are keenly aware of the remarkable extent to which the societies' members perform at the expected level--slaves generally behaving like the dull drudges their society expects them to be, and free men like the vigorous, constructive pillars of society they are expected to be. But the anthropologist is also aware of the demoralizing effects of gross discrepancies between principle and practice, and he sees some unusually wide discrepancies of the sort in American culture, as well as an unusually great number of mutually incompatible principles which Americans are expected to somehow reconcile.

Our romantic or rugged individualism, for example, becomes increasingly difficult of achievement in a highly industrialized economy which is less and less under the control of independent businessmen and more and more under the control of either corporate business or bureaucratic government. But these are only the most conspicuous limitations upon individualism. There are others far more subtle--a variety of demands for conformity. Disclaimer loyalty oaths required of teachers, the investigations into political opinion of teachers and others in public life, the hurling of more or less irresponsible charges of political disloyalty--all of these operate to frighten actual or would be political deviants back into the secure fold where the conformists huddle together out of inertia or simply for safety. In the fold they have equality--even if it be the equality of mediocrity and apathy, and Alexis De Tocqueville observed of us Americans as long ago as the 1830's that we would willingly sacrifice liberty for equality in spite of our high valuation of liberty.

Conformity and the resulting uniformity of thought and action are increasingly evident to students of American life. To be sure Americans still have rather more freedom than the average tribesman to choose a group or social strata with which to conform, yet the degree of freedom is limited. There are marked differences in behavior and opportunities as between the social classes which Americans accept in practice but deny in principle.

C. Wright Mills, reporting recently in White Collar on the "new middle class" of "propertyless people who wear street clothes to work, notes a steady increase in the proportion of this socio-economic class and in the sterile conformism of their lives. In 1870 some 6% of the labor force was "white collar"-- in 1940 the proportion had risen to about 25% (over half of these being salespeople and office workers). Whether we accept Mills' bleak picture of the lives these people lead, it is true that white collar workers and their families are the backbone of the new urban proletariat.

Radio, TV, tabloids, movies and other mass media promote standardization of the tastes and opinions of this urban proletariat, and in a curiously circular fashion. The great radio networks, for example, are supported largely by some 200 million dollars a year which represents revenue from advertising. The networks therefore conclude that they cannot afford to risk alienating or offending this source of support, with the result that major advertisers exert enormous control over the material which goes out over the airways. Proctor and Gamble "probably has more to say about what the American public will hear than any other single organization in America," (F. Gruber, in Annals) and P. and G., like other big advertisers, takes rather fantastic care to avoid offending anybody. Hence incidents like that involving Alexander Woolcott's "Town Crier" broadcasts, which were discontinued in 1935 "when the sponsor complained that Mr. Woolcott had criticized Hitler and Mussolini and might thus offend some listeners." Thus the anxieties of the advertisers, and of the networks combine to produce an innocuous radio fare guaranteed to provide nobody with any new ideas, and people unaccustomed to intellectual stimulus via the mass media become increasingly convinced that what they are getting is what they want, and proceed to confirm the preconceptions of those in control of the media.

Nor is the trend toward conformity to the mass culture seriously disturbed by the fresh ideas contained in at least some of the flood of books pouring from the presses of this highly literate society. Americans almost universally read something, to be sure, but the sport pages, the comics, the pulps and the slicks are their major fare. It has been estimated that about 20% of American adults read books, and that just 10% of our people do more than 2/3 of the book reading for the country.

But for all the growing evidences of and pressures toward conformity in American life, the anthropologist would still concede that the tolerance for deviance and the respect for the individual and his intellectual freedom remain remarkably and relatively high in contemporary America. He would note that the society's great centers of research and higher education continue to take very seriously their responsibilities for disseminating basic knowledge and maintaining standards of intellectual excellence, integrity, and above all, intellectual freedom. There is cultural vitality and the likelihood of societal survival so long as such sources of innovation remain vigorous in a society. For societal survival, like the survival of organic species depends in large part upon ability to adapt to changing circumstances, and circumstances change with staggering speed in our mid-century world. Adaptability depends upon innovation and a readiness to modify traditional culture when it becomes dysfunctional. It is safe to predict that when and if we throttle our innovators and the sources of their inspiration, and our society and culture set in a rigid mold, we shall soon be as dead as the dinosaurs.

As the anthropologist reads the record of the rise and fall of human societies, a too perfect integration of the social and cultural system is a mark of senescence. Contemporary America still harbors enough diversities and inconsistencies to be in no immediate danger of reaching senescence via that route, though our nativists would push us in that direction. There is also the polar hazard of inadequate integration, and this is our more immediate problem. The glaring discrepancies between some of our lofty humanitarian principles and our grossly discriminatory practices loom very large indeed on the contemporary scene. Notably there is the matter of race relations in America with so-called "white" Americans quite consistently flouting the American Creed in denying to the more than 1/10 of Americans who happen to be non-white equal access to jobs, education, housing, public health services, citizenship, and even, by implication at least, equal human status. There is anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism in this society dedicated to religious freedom. The list of such discrepancies could be greatly extended, and it is so extended by non-Americans who welcome evidences of our social and cultural infirmities.

The recent months have seen a great outcry concerning the level of morality in American public life, but the anthropological observer is unlikely to take the matter too seriously. A great deal of the smoke has been generated by political parties bent upon discrediting one another on a crucial political period, and such fire as actually exists appears to be of no greater proportions than the conflagrations of numerous other periods in our political history. Whatever is accomplished by way of disturbing political apathy will be a healthy development in a society predicated upon a universal political participation of which it falls far short. Here is a more basic problem of great import in the long range view, and another of the discrepancies which constitute a serious hazard to the survival of American society and culture.

So mid-century America, as an anthropologist sees it, is beset by problems. Its culture is marked by such disturbing symptoms as ethnocentrism, nativism, compulsive conformity, and gross discrepancies. But this is only a part of the picture, and we have not time to begin to sketch the whole. A more balanced, if less academic view was presented recently by an eminently wise observer, Elmer Davis, when he said about mankind as a whole what can as well be paraphrased to apply to America, -- "Americans will sometimes be foolish, unkind, even vicious, and will more often--and on the whole more disastrously--be stupid. But if there is something wrong with Americans there is also much that is right. They can be brave, they can be unselfish, they can think. So long as they keep on thinking--America has a future."

OPEN FORUM DISCUSSION

Remarks of the chairman:

Following Address by Dr. Goodman

Dr. Goodman has chosen to present intellectual failures in our living rather than dwell upon some of the more obvious factors which we read of in the daily newspapers. This perhaps leaves us somewhat speechless. These deeper currents in our society are reflections of a basic philosophy about American life; as such, they are far more than superficial aspects of our living.

Question 1. What is to be the further relationship, do you think, between anthropology and sociology?

Answer: The future relationship between anthropology and sociology is to some degree already present at Harvard where, for example, there has now been for about 3 years a department known as the department of social relations. This is made up of the pre-existing departments of sociology, cultural anthropology, and much of psychology. We had to count psychology in also. Actually the relationship between cultural anthropology and particularly social psychology is becoming increasingly

close. People training specifically in one of those fields are now generally required to have a fairly extensive knowledge in the other two, and there is a great deal of collaboration. It is unfashionable in any of these three fields to go back and do a research project which has any pretention without having a team. You have to have team research these days. You know there are fashions in science as there are in anything else, and perhaps there are fashions in your field too. There are publications and meetings which bring people from these three fields together not only on the research level, but also on the discussion level. There is in existence a Society of Applied Anthropology and when one attends the meetings of this group, she finds a half dozen, if not more fields represented. In spite of these evidences of growing collaboration, there is no thought whatever that the fields will lose their identity.

Question 2. I am concerned with individualism, the group process, and training for leadership.

Answer: Well, it is like this. As I see it, our cultural individualism in so far as it is actually productive of something on the behavior level, by no means suggests or implies that group process doesn't remain enormously important. After all, individuals, no matter how ruggedly individualistic, still have to operate in and through groups. And of course, in American culture there is also heavy emphasis upon cooperation; our emphases upon individualism and competition tend sometimes to be in contradiction with our emphases upon cooperation. In my mind however, there is no necessary incompatibility between individualism and group process; in fact, they must go along together.

Now, as to providing training for leadership. Here I am getting very much out of my depth, I think, but this is just very much off the cuff. Leaders must be encouraged towards individualism in the sense that they must be encouraged to think independently, to operate, not independently of a group, but free from the need of compulsive conformity with the group; this in order that they have security. The thing that psychologists worry about today is the tendency to escape into the group as a refuge into almost automatic conformity; this is conformity as a way of finding security, as a means of feeling safe in a world which in many ways leaves the individual very much exposed. This you can't have in individuals whom you are training for leadership. They must be individuals who are psychologically strong enough to stand on their own feet and make their own decisions through some creative and constructive thinking even if the group may be against the point. They must, of course, understand group process, the dynamics of group action, and be able to work with or through these. That's the best I can do.

Question 3: We do a great deal of study of the movement of individuals. Do you think it possible that because of our professional knowledge of movement we could contribute something to studies in your field?

Answer: I don't think that there is any question that you could make an enormous contribution, and this again is the kind of collaborative study that is important far beyond the fashionable. I was being facetious a little while ago and rather poking fun at collaborative study. Of course, actually it is enormously important and enormously productive.

Question 4. Dr. Goodman, it seems to me that the tendency towards ethnocentrism and nativism is making us in education very vulnerable. We do have, I believe, a way of starting with ethnocentrism (attitudes) which attacks our degree of freedom. Why can we not instead of being on the defensive and saying that a professor has his right to academic freedom, simply say that the American way of teaching is thus and so; it is essentially a part of our heritage; we accept difference in the "true" American way of life, and this acceptance of difference has made America.

It seems to me that it is extremely impressive when one considers the conformity that you have been pointing out to realize that everyone of us has been to an elementary school where, by and large, instead of purposeful activity we have an adult dominated procedure which is just grinding in conformity. Possibly the real ghost in the closet is the teacher training institution. Can't we in physical education do something about this? Can we make the whole physical education experience one of purposefulness and the individual development of thinking and so on? At present we are just making the conformists that you speak of for Proctor and Gamble to pick up on their surveys.

Other voice: It is the teachers who do not follow this cut and dried pattern of classroom teaching who are attacked.

Other voice: That's right. Our friend, Mr. - - - would like all teachers to operate in exactly the same manner.

Other voice: And really we should turn our attention to the teacher training institutions as the source of this trouble.

No record of an answer to this question 4 by Dr. Goodman.

Question 5. What do you consider to be the goal of community organizations (especially those dealing with adult education) in this job?

Answer: I think that frequently they do not play as active and vital a role as they might, that their leadership is perhaps not as courageous and forward thinking and creative as it might be. There seems to be some tendency for conservative elements to gain control of organizations of that sort partly because of expediency. It's safer; you don't offend anybody or at any rate your chances of offending people is lessened if the organization is kept pretty conservative in its policies. So that on the whole my feeling would be that we need more daring, more courage, more boldness in the leadership of community organization of many sorts and that they could make greater contribution than is the case at present.

Question 6. We know that the either-or philosophy gives us a feeling of security. We also realize that America is filled with anxiety. How can we teach the more realistic approach to the study of our basic problems and at the same time calm down the anxiety in our country?

Answer: To the degree that this is an age of anxiety, it is not the most propitious time in the world to be teaching new thought processes and patterns. But I think it is true that we must make a beginning in that direction. It is not apparently necessary to have this particular kind of intellectual crutch in order to have a sense of security; not all people are given to either-or thinking as we are; this is an aspect of culture, it is not a human inevitability. I think that we can get away from it. Teacher training institutions can do any amount of good here, not necessarily by giving lectures on the subject although that might help to some degree, but most particularly by demonstrating in their own procedures a tendency to think along a continuum in terms of degrees of difference rather than in terms of either-or. Demonstrations of this very different habit of thought will, I think, gradually bring some results. Teachers and parents and social workers can do such fantastic things in bringing about changes!

Question 7. We hear a great deal today about the role of the school in bringing about needed changes. I am thinking particularly about a situation where one day the children being addressed by an outside speaker on certain matters, one child got up and said: "We're learning a great deal about this, but what are we going to do about our parents?" What would your profession suggest in talking to parents?

Answer: I'm afraid that I would have to answer that my profession does not suggest much of anything along those lines except by implication and indirection. It is perfectly true that changes generally come into a culture through the new generation, not through the old. The new generations tolerate as best they can the old generation and the old thinking until those have departed. This is one of the things we simply have to say quite candidly to children whose ideas are becoming different than their parents and we think better than their parents. We have to help them to understand that their parent's thinking was produced by the times in which their parents grew up. That times have changed, situations are different, new ideas have appeared, and it is unrealistic to expect our parents to completely shift their points of view. People don't ordinarily relearn basic points of view in full adulthood and beyond. I think frankly that we have to help the children to a certain tolerance of their parents and I don't mean a sense of superiority to them either, because that would be unfair, very unfair. This tolerance towards people who have different points of view is not easy to maintain and practice, tolerance without a sense of superiority. I think we owe it to the parents and to the children themselves to help them to understand their parents, to be tolerant of them in the sense of active understanding of difference. Along with this we can suggest to the children that they need not feel any real guilt in differing radically in their points of view from their mothers and fathers. Sometimes, somehow they are made to feel disloyal, an expression of ingratitude for what the parents have done for them, etc., etc. Of course, parents are not unlikely to encourage this point of view, often times subconsciously. We can suggest to the children that it is no act of ingratitude to have honest intellectual differences, nor is it a negation of love and affection. If we can help the children to develop this rather healthy kind of orientation towards their parents, they will usually get a reciprocal readiness from the parents to meet them at least part of the way. I don't think that many parents are going to change over their attitudes to conform with that of their children, attitudes that the children have learned in school or somewhere outside the home, but some parents will make some effort some part of the time if they in turn have not been met by just plain, out and out antagonism and rejection and rebellion. Do you see what I mean? The psychological basis of the relationship there is enormously important.

Question 8. I am in a large city high school. The teachers are becoming increasingly disturbed by the number of students who apparently are not intelligent enough to do the type of thinking we need. How far would you modify your emphasis on avoiding nativism and ethnocentrism in regard to these children who seem to be inferior? Is that a result of their early training or must we treat them differently?

Answer: These children seem to be inferior, you say. What is their background?

Question. As to nationality? Some have parents who are foreign born, a great many are underprivileged financially; they do lack what we call I.Q. and moral standards.

Answer: A nicely qualified statement; admirably cautious and advisably so, since I think we are all aware of the fact that the I.Q. does not measure entirely and purely and simply inherent intellectual ability, particularly by the time youngsters get on to high school. Well, on the whole of course it is true that one has to adjust her level of expectations to the readiness of one's students to absorb what is to be taught or presented. We can't always go as fast as we would like. It seems to me that in dealing with underprivileged children, children whose cultural background is somewhat different from that of the American child, children who, therefore, are to some extent handicapped because they have not had in their homes or communities opportunities to learn the same kinds of things which most American children have learned, we do have to go a little more slowly and adjust our expectations to the level from which the group is operating. We do draw upon this incidental experience gained outside the classroom far more than we realize. This is the reason why when you have children whose general background is not fully

American, then you have children who are to some degree handicapped. Basically you can only find out the level at which the group is able to operate by trial and error. You try them out, and you push them just as fast and as far as you possibly can, and I think that they can go faster and farther than we may initially expect. By making a relatively slow start at the beginning of the year, speeding up the tempo just as fast as seems possible, you may find at the end of the year that they have accomplished over-all much more than you expected initially. I am not sure that this answers your question.

Question 9. I am really wondering if we should indoctrinate to some extent to give the student some guidance. In your opinion is this dangerous?

Answer: I think there is practically always danger in indoctrination. Perhaps the most particular thing about a youngster who comes from a home where the parents are foreign born may be that the home has been authoritarian. Here is the child with whom we should be most careful, I think: not to give the authoritarian approach again just because he gets it at home. How can he ever learn to operate with democratic concepts if he never experiences anything but an authoritarian situation? To me deliberate indoctrination is an aspect of the authoritarian situation. Rather must we teach people to think, and I do not care what their I.Q. may be, they can all think. They may not be able to think on quite the same level about quite the same things or in quite the same fashion, but granted an I.Q. somewhere near normal, they can think. This is to me the great task of education.

DISCUSSION GROUPS

(Following Address by Dr. Goodman)

General Education Group

1. How can we in education, and especially in physical education, modify our practices to reduce the current emphasis noticeable throughout mid-century American life upon "ethnocentricity," "Either-or-thinking," and "nativism"?
2. How can we contribute to the ability of both individual and group to survive tension, hysteria, fear, etc.?
3. Have we extended ourselves to a realization of the possibilities of the creative approach throughout our activity program?
4. How can we in physical education retain the values of group experience and achievement without loss of individualism?
5. What responsibility does physical education have for setting standards which are sufficiently high to challenge college students (in areas of health, care of the body, leisure time use, movement, human relations, etc.)?
"People tend to behave on the whole as they are expected to behave."

Teacher Education Group

The group showed a tendency to critical evaluation of their own practices and curriculum in preparing teachers, reported on new constructive experiments which have been implemented, and emphasized the great need for constantly scrutinizing every change in plan or practice to avoid the ever present danger of training teachers of the subject, rather than teachers in the education of children.

Due to the great influx of foreign speaking pupils, the subject of Nativism was brought home by one member who found homogenous national areas in her country caused too great adherence to customs and antagonisms. Recreation of the Mixer type was suggested as a solution.

INTRODUCTION OF DR. RUBY JO REEVES KENNEDY

"Dr. Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy came originally from Texas. She did her undergraduate work at the Texas State College for Women and received her advanced degrees from Yale University. She has served as teacher of public speaking in a Texas High School; research assistant at the Yale Institute of Human Relations; assistant director of a sampling of urban studies in consumer purchases, Bureau of Labor Statistics in Washington; instructor in sociology at Texas State College for Women, and then came North and East to Vassar College where she spent six years; since 1945, she has been professor of sociology and chairman of the department at Connecticut College. In reading her history in Who's Who, I discovered that she is the author of "The Social Adjustment of Morons" -- the full title is "in a Connecticut City." I don't know whether she is going to talk to us as morons or because we perhaps have some interest in morons. Her late husband was a professor of anthropology at Yale University. She therefore understands the inter-relations of the two disciplines. Her subject today is "Women, Work, and Marriage."

Dr. Kennedy --

WOMEN, WORK, AND MARRIAGE

Dr. Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy

The topic "Women, Work and Marriage" is one in which I think that we as women educators are particularly interested. To begin with, may I call your attention to a few general statistics. First, our pattern of living in America is on a family basis. Nine-tenths of the American population live in families. Most individuals live in two families through the course of their life-times. They are born into one family--their parental family--and as adults they form their own marital families. In April 1951, there were 39,800,000 families in our society. This represents an increase of 7 million families since 1940. Most of the 1951 families (39,133,000) were composed of both husband and wife. The size of the family has, however, decreased slightly during this ten-year period. In 1951 the average family in America had 3.5 children as compared with 3.8 in 1940. Statistics show an increasing tendency to remarry; 14 percent of all family heads in America have been married two or more times. In one out of every eight couples getting married, one person has been previously married. For every one divorced or separated person in 1951 there were 19 married people. So, we are not only a highly married population, but also a highly remarried one. Furthermore, the age of marriage is decreasing for both men and women, dropping from 26.1 years in 1890 for men to 22.6 years in 1951 and from 22.0 to 20.4 years for women. There is, then, the tendency for more and more people to marry, for more and more people to marry younger, and upon divorce, for more and more people to remarry. Obviously, marriage is a popular piece of behavior in our society. It is something Americans believe in; it is something they like; it is something most of them do. If there has been any change, it is in the direction of marriage becoming more popular with Americans.

In connection with marriage, we are thinking today of the woman in particular and of the role she plays other than that of being a married woman. In April 1951, there were 19 million women in the labor force; of these 8,700,000 were married. Ten years before, in 1940, there were only 5,000,000 married women working. This is an increase of three million married women working during this ten-year period. About a third of all the paid workers in our society are women, more than half of whom (62 per cent) are married. We see, thus, that married women exceed, numerically, unmarried women in the labor force.

We are interested, also, in statistics concerning the married women with children who are working. In 1950, 14 per cent of all the women with children under six years of age were in the labor force, and 30 per cent of all women with children six to eighteen years of age were working. This shows that the mother of the child above six years is almost twice as likely to be working as is the mother of a child below six years.

We are also concerned with the older women workers--those 45 years of age and over. They constitute 31 per cent of all the women in the present labor force. They are the women who have completed their families, who don't have young children, and who have reentered or stayed in the labor market.

Now why do women work? We hear many explanations why women work, with the most common being to escape the boredom of housework, or to earn extra pin money, or for some other of many trivial reasons. Actually, however, women usually work because they have to. Self-support is the dominant reason for most women being employed. According to the Women's Bureau, 8 out of every 100 women work for one of three reasons: to buy a home, to pay debts, or to help educate their children. Another eight women work solely because they love their jobs. The other 84 work because they need to in order to support themselves and their dependents. A recent study of 8,300 women in 100 trade unions reported approximately the same conclusion, namely, that 86 out of every 100 women worked to

support themselves and their dependents. These facts reveal, therefore, that women work for exactly the same reason that men work: they need the money.

What do women workers do? The jobs held by married women are not very different from those filled by unmarried women except that they enter fewer occupations and fill top positions less frequently. More than half of the married women who work are engaged in manual occupations-- those which are not well paid and which do not carry high social status. Listed in order of their numerical importance these occupations are: domestic service, sales work, operatives in cotton and apparel factories, teaching and a few clerical positions, proprietors, managers, and officials of eating and drinking establishments, keepers of boarding and lodging houses, and finally, charwomen, janitors, and cooks. With the exception of teaching and the few clerical positions, which are the smallest, proportionately, most of these are manual jobs which carry low wages and low social status in our society.

Employers appear reluctant to hire and train married women for responsible and top positions. They seem to have the notion that married women are very likely to be working only because they wish to buy something in particular (a chair, a rug, a car) or to supplement the husband's salary and as soon as the purchases are made or the family finances improved, the women will stop work. There is, furthermore, in the case of married women always the possibility of pregnancy which would probably involve maternity leaves. So for these and other reasons not mentioned, employers may feel that married women employees are not good economic risks and are, consequently, hesitant to employ them. Incidentally, I have been unable to get reliable and comprehensive statistics about maternity leaves, but I think this is a topic which should be explored further. For the most part, the professions, businesses, and industry have not tried to attract married women by offering them satisfactory maternity leaves.

Only 6 per cent of the individuals listed in the 1948-49 edition of Who's Who in America were women. In other words, 94 per cent of the entrees in that book were men. This is not a very creditable showing for women. But of the women listed there, 61 per cent were or had been married at some time; 39 per cent had never been married. While this does not equal the proportion that married women constitute of the entire population, it represents an increase since 1926-27 when a study of the marital status of women listed in Who's Who in America revealed that 53 per cent were married. We see, therefore, that there has been a slightly increased tendency in the professions, as measured by women whose names are entered in Who's Who in America, to combine the two roles of marriage and work.

In connection with this it is important to consider part-time work since this is especially pertinent to married women. Many jobs in our society are regularly done on a part-time basis, but it is not always easy to find qualified personnel available since most people who work need to do so for monetary reasons which usually necessitates a full-time job. Especially is there need for part-time workers in agriculture, in domestic service, in wholesale and retail trade, and in service industries other than domestic work. Three out of every five regular part-time workers are women, and the majority of these are married. This kind of work provides married women with an excellent opportunity to maintain their homes and to rear their children. The following is a quotation from a bulletin published by the Women's Bureau entitled "The Part-Time Worker": "The typical woman part-time worker is married, lives in a family household of three persons with two members employed, and does all her own housework except perhaps the laundry. She is somewhere between 35 and 45 years of age, she has a high school education, and has had some previous full-time work experience. Her children, if she has any, are probably in their teens or older, and she expects to continue working."

A detailed study was made by the Women's Bureau of 1853 part-time women workers in 10 cities employed by 1071 different employers. Almost all of the employers expressed great satisfaction with these part-time workers. Employers said the use of part-time workers enable them to get trained women who were willing to work when they were needed. But one of the most important conclusions of this study is that seldom did the part-time workers depend solely upon their own earnings for a living. They used their earnings as supplemental income and often regarded their salaries as incidental to the personal advantages that they gained from working. They reported that they felt that they were making a social contribution which they were able to do through the availability of part-time employment. As has been mentioned earlier, this is not nearly as likely to be true of full-time workers for most of them are not working from choice, or because they love their jobs, or because of interest in their jobs, but because they need the money.

Especially desirable, it seems to me, is part-time work for the college graduate or the highly trained woman, because it enables her to keep her hand in, so to speak, and at the same time to manage her home and to rear her children. But even of greater importance than this is the fact that after her busy child-rearing years are over, she is still conversant with her job or her profession. She has kept up because she has had to in order to hold the job. It is so easy for one to lose connection with the new developments in a field unless one makes a continuous and constant effort to keep up. Interest alone may be a sufficient stimulant to some people to do so, but to most people it is not. People often intend to keep up, but the finest stimulant is a job at which one performs under the constant pressure of competition with other workers. Also important is the ever-present possibility, particularly in this war age, that women will be left with children whom they must support. The part-time woman worker is ready to expand, when necessary, into a full-time worker. Also, part-time work is important because of the possibility it affords an individual for her own personality growth and expansion. She knows what is going on in the world outside her home, not from hearing about this from her husband, her children, the newspaper, the radio, and so on; but because she is actually a part of the day-by-day business processes and procedures.

Part-time work, it seems to me, is also desirable because the married woman then may have an urgent reason for conducting her home on an efficient basis. If she is at home only part of the time, it is possible that she will do an hour's work in an hour, whereas if she has three hours, she might well spend the three hours doing the same job. The housewife may constantly ask herself these questions: Why have high standards? Who pays any attention? Who knows? Who cares? Who rewards?

Also, working part time may cause the housewife and the mother to learn to treasure the time that she has with her children and their relationship may be of infinitely more superior quality than it would be if her time with them were unlimited. The working mother is no longer accepted as a person always on hand. The working mother may no longer tacitly be regarded by her children as someone to be imposed upon. And, incidentally, the imposition that the mother has traditionally suffered at the hands of her children may enhance their attitudes towards her and it may not. It may make them respect her considerably more and love her in a deeper way, and it may not. And it, likewise, may not enhance her attitude toward them. The working mother is in a position where she must be cooperated with because she, too, like the father and the children, has things to do outside the home. Her time, also, is valuable. It is impossible to make generalizations because so much depends upon the woman, upon her particular husband, and upon the atmosphere of their home, but I strongly suspect that this situation is a potentially good one for engendering in the young child ideas about cooperation, about respect for parents as persons, as well as the development of the child's self-reliance and independence, and ability to participate with others in tasks to be

done jointly for the family's mutual pleasure.

In connection with women working, some mention should be made of war. War has contributed significantly to getting women out of the home and into industry. The Civil War brought women together into community serving rooms and gave them opportunities to replace men in teaching positions. The first World War gave them skilled jobs in factories, and World War II offered women the first opportunity to work in assembly and inspection operations where it is said they revealed special aptitudes. For the first time in World War II, women replaced men as welders, as riveters and in innumerable kinds of skilled work on railroads, in shipyards, and in aircraft factories.

Rallying to their country's need of utilizing all able bodied manpower, women were no longer discriminated against. If they worked, they were not forced into domestic and other service occupations. Employers, desperate for workers, hired and trained women for jobs that they would never before have considered women able to perform, and in each instance women demonstrated their capabilities and versatilities. As always in war periods, wages soared and women, no longer relegated to the lower paid jobs, found new and personally rewarding monetary reasons for working. After each war period, a great many women withdrew immediately and returned to their homes, but never as many as were anticipated and particularly was this true in World War II. It had been estimated and predicted that a high proportion of women workers, especially married women workers, would retire immediately to their homes. They did not do that. Surprisingly large numbers of them continued to work. Various studies conducted by the Women's Bureau have revealed that not only were a great many of them unwilling to give up their jobs and retire into their homes, but they were also unwilling to return to the lower paid positions and particularly to the service occupations. If any of you has had any experience in the last two or three years with trying to engage domestic workers, you will know the difficulties of so doing.

This is a repercussion of the war. Women have always been in domestic or "service" occupations where they encountered no resistance and no competition. Wars, and especially the last one, opened other opportunities to them and allowed them to demonstrate that they could do other jobs quite adequately and satisfactorily. One of several studies made by the Women's Bureau of the effect of the war upon the employment of women revealed these conclusions: (1) domestic service is the only occupation in which there was a loss of women workers; (2) manufacturing industries experienced the greatest gain (over 100 per cent); (3) clerical and kindred workers showed the second largest gain (84 per cent); (4) professional and semi-professional occupational gains were the smallest (1.2 per cent).

Part of the reason for the small decline in the postwar employment of women is due to older women workers of 35 years of age and above. Although most women in the labor market are 20 to 24 years of age, 60 per cent of the wartime increase of women workers was due to women 35 years of age and above. These women were new workers in the labor force of our society. They had not been there before except as domestic and service workers. Now they learned new skills, earned good wages, and became a vital part of the war effort. They were, furthermore, the women who did not intend to retire from work after the war. There was no reason why they should: those who were married had older children so that their child-caring and home responsibilities were not heavy. Women's Bureau studies have shown that in war congested areas 81 per cent of the women workers 45 years of age and over said that they did not intend to retire as contrasted with 70 to 75 per cent of the 20 to 24 year old women war workers who said, "Yes, we are going to retire. As soon as our men return we're going to get married and we're going to walk right out of the labor market." Many of them have not done so, but they had expected to. The older women didn't even express such an anticipation or

desire. They wanted to continue working and earning.

Now what is the relationship of this to women's homes, to their husbands, and, particularly, to their children? What I have just said about the value of part-time work needs no repeating. The reason I mentioned these ideas in connection with part-time work is because I regard that work situation as almost ideal for those few years when it is important that the mother should spend a great deal of time in the home but not necessarily all of her time. The part-time worker may feel less guilty about working if she feels that she has not abandoned entirely her home and her children. If she is home at regularly stipulated intervals and the children can depend upon her being there, then she may not feel guilty in pursuing her own work interests. I mention this guilt feeling because I think that in our society we have a pattern of thinking which causes the married woman, particularly the married woman who is also a mother, to feel that she may be neglecting the important task of caring for her children, if she does anything other than that. Now it is highly conceivable that she may not be able to combine the two; not all women can, not all women should, not all women want to. But part of our cultural ideology is the thought that "woman's place is in the home," and that she should stay there, that she should be supported by her man, and if she acts differently then she may lose some aspects of femininity cherished in our culture. By working only part time women may combine the two roles quite happily.

In the discussion of this general topic, I think that we must consider briefly the education of women in our society today. You know, as well as I, that today it is as customary for girls as for boys to go to college. It is becoming more and more usual for our wives and mothers to be college trained women. This means that educators should think seriously about college education, since it is so frequently considered a contributory factor to the unhappiness of the college trained wife and mother. Now I don't know why we are so sure that it is usual today for the wife and mother to be unhappy, but it appears that she is in quite a dilemma. Some of you may have read the literature in this field and if so, I think that you must be concerned about what will become of this frustrated, unhappy, neurotic woman. Some writers feel that her education has failed to bring personal happiness to the college trained woman. If one reads widely in the field, one might conclude that higher education may well be a detriment rather than an asset as far as happiness in marriage and motherhood is concerned. One well known writer, whose name I shall not mention, makes this comment: "Amiable, ignorant, bovine women make much better mothers than neurotic college graduates." I agree that neurotic women may make poor mothers, but my query is concerned with the implication that nearly all women college graduates are neurotic.

The question is, "Is the modern woman too highly educated for those tasks with which she is going to be confronted after college, namely in her roles of wife and mother?" And, incidentally, this is what most of them do. Most of them marry and become mothers. A recent study of women students in a large eastern women's college reported that the majority of the students were looking forward to marriage and motherhood as the center of their future lives. That's what they anticipated. Sixty per cent expressed no desire at all to continue with a job after they've had children, but anticipated eagerly the career of housewife. Thirty per cent voted for full time domestic life with the reservation they might return to work after their children were older. The other 10 per cent unhesitatingly said that they intended to combine family and career with no break in either. Statistics from the Women's Bureau show us, however, that there is an increasingly strong trend in the opposite direction. That is, what they really do is often quite different from what they said while in college they expected to do upon graduation.

Another recent study of a small group of women students in another eastern women's college reported that most of the girls are "marriage oriented." In speaking

about the possibility of working after marriage, they seemed to have two viewpoints--to do so if their husbands did not object or if conditions warranted it, but in general they were unconcerned about preparing for work; rather did they look forward to marrying and to marrying men who could support them and men who would not want them to work. To repeat again, on a statistical basis, an increasingly large proportion of them do work, and they work because they need to.

Now returning again to our larger question "Has college training unfitted the woman for what she expects to be her full time task after graduation, namely homemaking and child training?" We know that the typical family pattern in America tends to draw the housewife out of circulation, and to restrict her activities considerably. The early years of her marriage have often been referred to as the "nursery years," the years when she is heavily burdened, actually overburdened, with work and responsibilities which pertain almost exclusively to the home, and according to the traditional ideas about the women, it is in this relatively short period of time that she fulfills her chief duty in life by bearing and training children.

Not to be minimized for a single minute is the importance of child training and especially I think should we note that this is the one realm in which woman is exclusively preeminent. It is the one thing that women do which men cannot do. Incidentally, I was interested in noticing a statement in an article contained in this month's issue of one of the leading women's magazines, which said that "what's wrong with men is that they have forever been envious because women could bear children and they couldn't; and that our problem of the future is not the neurotic woman, but the neurotic man who is neurotic because of his envy of women." The home situation can be, and often is, a lonely type of life--the husband is gone all day; the wife's most constant companions are her children who, while a delight and a joy in many respects, do have certain limitations with reference to conversation, exchange of ideas, and offering generally stimulating and satisfying companionship. There surely exists a gratifying and rewarding kind of relationship between a mother and her children, but until they leave home to go to school, they give her an immature kind of companionship which is not comparable with the reciprocity of adult relationships.

The average housewife has to do all the work unless she earns something to supplement her husband's earnings. More than likely she even does the laundry and the heavy work. Work in the home, therefore, limits her opportunities for contact with other adults; with her greatest outlet for conversation probably being delivery men and other sales people. These tend to restrict conversation to certain obvious topics. Even daily chats with the neighbors do not break the monotony for they probably talk about their common interests--the price of food, the care of their home and their children. I subscribe heartily to the idea that women can be thinking about all kinds of things while washing diapers, ironing, cooking, and so on; and it is my hope that they do so, but I don't think that we must ever lose sight of the fact that the woman is faced constantly with the urgency of the immediate situation--the crying baby, the supper to be prepared, the dishes to be done, the house to be cleaned, the shirts to be ironed, and so on. She is undoubtedly so preoccupied with the urgency of those immediate tasks that it is hard for her to recall the fine lecture she heard on Chaucer and so on and so on, and plan future articles that she intends to write. Much effort, in other words, has to be exerted to keep the housewife from becoming intellectually dull and kitchen-minded.

When the nursery years are over and the children spend an increasingly greater part of the day away from home, she has more free time for herself, and she may be able to recall and revitalize her intellectual interests and she may not. It will depend to some extent upon the sincerity of her earlier interest, and here, all too often I think, we see a reflection of intellectual immaturity

which did not survive the recession. And I might say that I do not think that there is any inevitable connection between this intellectual retrogressive process and the fact that the person is a female. Under similar circumstances, I think the same thing would probably happen to a male. Unless she is very careful, the homemaker must guard assiduously against losing the distinctiveness of her own personality. She can so easily submerge herself in the personalities of her husband and her children who become, in a vicarious manner, her channels of access to the outside world. I don't think this inevitably happens, but it is the line of least resistance and it can easily and often does occur. The homemaker must needle herself constantly to see that this does not happen, because if it does then she ceases to exist as a separate, interesting, invigorating, distinctive personality. College administrators can, if they care to do so, fortify themselves with all kinds of facts about what women actually do after graduation, and if they care to go to the trouble and expense, they may also find out what their training program has actually given their graduates as preparation for the roles they perform in society today.

I think that college should try to give women a sound, solid kind of education which becomes an integral part of them. This may be merely imbuing a woman with an insatiable intellectual curiosity and an inquiring mind. She may frequently have to postpone satisfying this intellectual curiosity, but if it is there as a vital part of intellectual training, it and she will survive the "nursery years." Should colleges actually assume a responsibility for training women to be homemakers, wives, and mothers as far as the day-by-day process of homemaking is concerned? This is an important question facing many of our colleges. At this recent June graduation, I was interested in noting several newspaper stories about women returning to their college reunions and their innumerable comments about what they had been doing and what they thought about the value of their college training. I shall not attempt to summarize these for you, because I think you probably read them too. And if so, you were undoubtedly struck with their varying and widely disparate recommendations as to what they thought college should do for them, or whether they thought college had failed them. But my own personal answer to this question of whether college, particularly women's colleges, should assume some responsibility for training women to be homemakers, wives, and mothers is "no, not as such." In the first place, one cannot train a person to be a mother until she becomes a mother. It is utterly impossible. If you will pardon the personal reference, I will illustrate the point with myself. When the doctor came to see me after I'd been home from the hospital three or four days after the birth of my daughter, I said to her "Now doctor, about this crying business. What is your advice with reference to the crying baby? Shall I pick her up when she cries?" She replied, "Oh your instinct will tell you what to do." Although from my professional viewpoint she used the word "instinct" in a special kind of way, I knew what she meant. And she was right. I would soon determine the different kinds of cries and work out a method for handling each. The important point here is that no course in college on motherhood could teach one how actually to handle a baby in any of many specific situations. This is one of those things one learns to do in doing it. Well, the same thing is true of learning, specifically, how to be a good wife. But homemaking is, perhaps, another thing. By this I mean that one can develop efficient methods of study which may be transferred to efficient methods of homemaking. So that is what I mean when I say "No, college should not try to teach a girl specifically how to be a good wife and mother." Courses in psychology and sociology provide students with important and useful information concerning personality development, group living and so on. We can't offer practical courses in motherhood unless we have a group of mothers among our college students. Some college Home Economics Departments require their major students to reside in cottages on campus and practice at housekeeping. Often babies are "borrowed" so the students may observe the developmental process of the child as well as the part the child plays in the household. To be truly

practical, however, there should be some husbands and fathers also living in the cottages. Even without the men, or the "borrowed" babies, however, this partially realistic situation should be rewarding to those few young women who have these courses. College training should, however, aim at producing a person sufficiently flexible to adapt herself to life situations as they arise. She should have acquired enough maturity to be able to examine the immediate situation as it is related to the near and more distant future, and to plan for herself a way of handling it so that as it changes, she will be ready for those changes. She should realize the importance, particularly, of not yielding so completely to the urgency of the immediate day-by-day details as to erase her intellectual past and mar her intellectual future. If her college has trained her to be an alert, adaptable, flexible person imbued with an insatiable intellectual curiosity and a constantly inquiring mind, she will assume gracefully the confining role of motherhood and discharge its present responsibilities and be ready for other duties when they come.

Finally, I want to say that today women, like men, may exercise the full right of adult living. That is, they now have the privilege, if they wish, of making a dual contribution to society, that of wife, mother, and homemaker, as well as that of participator in industry. No one has ever yet suggested that upon marriage a man must choose between being a husband, father, and homemaker or being a member of the working force of our society. Of course the two situations are not strictly parallel. In addition to the mores which have decreed the respective and different roles of the sexes, there is also the undeniable fact that the woman is the bearer of children, which means, usually, a degree of physical incapacitation for a period of time. Obviously, the physical process of becoming a father does not burden a man similarly. But there are important elements to be considered in the living of a full life other than those related to parenthood, whether mother or father. Every individual should have the right to participate as freely as he wishes to and is able to in the cultural pattern of normal adulthood. Not to be overlooked is the fact that most of the normal activities in our contemporary industrialized, urbanized society are related to work, which is, incidentally, what every adult is supposed to want to do. Furthermore, work, and "success" at it, brings high status and prestige in our society. In our culture for the most part, the people who have achieved "success" have usually done so through some kind of gainful employment. The remuneration need not be of the highest and often isn't, but the outstanding and the most respected people in our culture are usually those who work or who have worked at some time in their lives. Occasionally artists and writers, who are ordinarily self-employed, attain distinction, but this is not common in American culture. In some instances, the respected men have inherited their wealth, but even so, they are supposed to make a personal contribution of some kind and carry on the work of their fathers and grandfathers.

The wife, mother, and homemaker never achieves a position of high distinction solely for her performance in these domestic roles--never. Mother's Day is a saccharine kind of honor occurring once a year. Work and success at it seems to be a necessary prerequisite to the attainment of a high personal rating in our culture. This rule applies not only to the men of outstanding distinction and note, but also to the average individual in the average little community of America. Seldom, for instance, would an habitually unemployed man be invited to serve on the local school board or to conduct a Community Chest campaign. It is a man who works regularly and consistently and through his industry and application gets ahead, as, for example, to the ownership of a filling station, or the manager of the local chain store, or the teller in a bank who is regarded as a dependable, solid citizen, who has demonstrated reliability and steadiness in the performance of his job for which he is paid, even though, as I said earlier, he need not earn

an enormous salary. He has competed with other workers. He has met and complied with job discipline to the extent of holding a job. The male never or seldom wins acclaim in the community for being a devoted, faithful husband and a wise, kind father. These qualities may, if the occasion presents itself, be mentioned as additional assets and fine attributes, but the individual in our culture usually wins recognition and prestige through accomplishments in the professional or business world and not in the affairs of the home, as such.

Now precisely the same may be said, incidentally, for the outstanding and well-known women in our society. The eminent women, those who have been famous, are the women who have achieved success as a consequence of their work outside the home. Not one woman is listed in Who's Who in America because of her success as a wife, mother, and homemaker.

Deeply embedded in our culture are ideas about the proper character and role typing of women. They are supposed to be independent, yet dependent; able, competent, efficient, ambitious, and industrious, yet not too assertive; feminine and dainty, yet not clinging and helpless. They are expected to work, to assume and discharge heavy responsibilities; yet not rival men. They have now become accepted as a normal, necessary part of the labor supply, yet they are not supposed to displace men or even compete seriously with them.

Modern women occupy an ambivalent position. Expected of them are behavior patterns which in themselves are markedly different, often quite contradictory. This polarity of opinion toward women is especially apparent in the area of gainful employment. The cultural idea that women's place is in the home has been the single important reason in limiting their job opportunities long after they demonstrated conclusively their capabilities of absorbing higher education and of being able, efficient, dependable, reliable workers.

It is quite likely that a new set of conflicts has arisen between men and women in the material situation because their traditional roles have been disturbed. Man's assumed superiority is being challenged and the two sexes are gradually but surely becoming more equal as far as economic opportunities are concerned. With their traditional roles being upset and without new ones being yet established, they are both left greatly confused. The one thing, however, which appears to be certain is that women, unmarried and married, have become a permanent part of the labor force of this country.

DISCUSSION GROUPS

(Following Address by Dr. Kennedy)

General Education Group

1. What can be the means towards a maximum realization of the possibilities of the college program in physical education to the dual rôle of women in present day American society: 1) marriage and family plus community life; 2) vocational interests and contribution?
2. What kinds of semi-professional education can we give to girls with interests in special phases of physical education to the end that they may later be used in part time work for gainful employment?
3. How can we in our college physical education program contribute to an understanding of women's dual role in present day society?
4. Does our guidance program assist college women to adopt a realistic point of view regarding the future? Do they realize that many of them will combine paid work with marriage? Do they have opportunities to discuss problems relating to this dual role?
5. Are college women learning to organize their time efficiently? Do they value this ability as essential to planning work outside and in the home?
6. Do college women know how to make a group approach to the solution of group problems?
7. Is there sufficient opportunity for our students to integrate the facts and principles learned from courses in health, physical education, and recreation? Do they focus and apply them to problems of home and community living?
8. Are we giving college women the opportunity to study the developmental play life of children? Their physical growth and health needs?
9. Are we giving our students a chance to contribute community service while in college, and to appreciate their responsibility for this type of service?
10. Are we providing college women with information which will help them to evaluate and develop community recreation programs and resources? Community health programs? School physical education programs?
11. Are we assisting our students to evaluate various forms of recreational activities in terms of (a) personality development, (b) family life environment, (c) cost?
12. Are we assisting college women to acquire varied recreational skills and to explore recreational resources (a) within themselves, (b) in their environment? Are they conscious of the need for initiative and discrimination in the use of leisure in order to resist the pressure of mass-production in recreation?
13. Are our students learning to use extra-curricular projects as an independent source of education, thus getting into the habit of self-direction and continuous self-education?

Teacher Education Group

Early marriage affects students preparing for a profession as well as those in a general course.

In the past married students had to leave school. Now we accept the situation but it required handling.

We must instill enthusiasm for the home and for home-making.

The problem of the competition for the time of children and adolescents is a pressing one.

However when there is a gap in the program many are unable to entertain themselves. They seem unresourceful. They lack inner resources and personal initiative to individual recreation.

In curriculum planning we must provide some training which will be of value when the girl may later want to take a part-time job. Part-time work is most frequently (a) domestic, (b) sales (c) factory operator. There is a reluctance to train for a job.

INTRODUCTION OF DR. ESTHER LLOYD-JONES

Members of the Conference and Friends, it is a happy occasion for me to have the pleasure of introducing Dr. Esther Lloyd-Jones. It so happens that my first teaching position was at Northwestern University where I found that one of the outstanding student leaders was a young woman named Esther McDonald. Everyone knew at that time that Esther would go places and do things, and her presence here today is concrete evidence of this prophecy. In addition to graduating from Northwestern, she has acquired a Masters and Doctors Degree from Columbia University, a husband, and two children. She is, at present, chairman of the Department of Student Personnel Administration at Teachers College, Columbia University and Head of the Guidance Laboratory. She has been active on boards of such national organizations as the Girl Scouts, Y.W.C.A., and Deans of Women. She is a Fellow of the National Council of Women Psychologists and an author of books in student personnel administration and education. Dr. Esther Lloyd-Jones will speak to us this morning on "Assets and Liabilities of Women in Human Relations."

ASSETS AND LIABILITIES OF WOMEN IN HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

DR. ESTHER LLOYD-JONES

I am going to state at the outset that I have found this an intriguing but an extraordinarily slippery problem to analyze. One very logical attack upon it was to review the several books that have attempted to bring together and compare data concerning men's and women's abilities, and especially as these abilities might relate to human relationships. Many such books contain a lot of hoakum, of course; they merely reflect and then attempt to "prove" that certain beliefs--or myths--about psychological differences between men and women are "true"--that there is confirmation for prejudice in verifiable measurements.

As I reviewed these books with as skeptical a mind as possible, I was continually reminded of lectures I had had in graduate school back in the late twenties when Thorndike, Pintner, and Gates all earnestly explained that intelligence testing had shown more variability of scores for boys than for girls--that boys went higher than girls, but that they also went lower, on test scores. They pointed out that while men wrote more books, made more discoveries, held more big jobs, invented more inventions, created more music, painted more great pictures, etc., there were far more boys than girls in institutions for the feeble minded. They also pointed out that men grew taller and weighed more--that there was more physical variability in men than in women. As I remember it, their lectures even referred to the fact that 106 boy babies were born for every 100 girl babies, but that more boy babies were organically inferior so that they died in greater numbers and so the numbers of males and females were equalized before maturity. The implication was plain that the organ inferiority of some males was compensated for by the organ superiority of others--that variability here, too, was greater than among females. Women, by and large, could count on struggling along successfully with mediocre bodies. One general conclusion from their carefully developed lectures, so ingeniously documented with all sorts of objective facts and figures, was that women were the great balancers of society--they are neither so good nor so bad as men in any respect. Men, on the other hand, are the members of society who both tear society down and make whatever progress is to be made. After men have made gains, women can help hold them for society. Women are quite bright enough, by and large, to understand progress, and are able to maintain it after it has been established, but they have not and will not contribute many new elements to it.

Of course this point of view has been effectively challenged and torn to pieces. Leta Stetter Hollingworth established, by measuring a large number of boy and girl babies at birth, that physical variability was quite as large for girl babies as for boys. Later studies have shown that variability of scores on well-designed intelligence tests is just as great for girls as for boys. Of course, there seem to be differences in the ways in which cultural influences affect boys and girls, and these differences are reflected increasingly as boys and girls grow older, in the sort of scores they make on different types of so-called intelligence tests. But, on the whole, the carefully erected theory that "proved" that biologically determined psychological differences between men and women account for men's outstanding achievements and women's mediocrity has pretty well fallen to pieces. One finds practically no reputable psychologists nowadays engaging in the sort of scientific romancing that we now know characterized the biological variability theory.

And yet I occasionally come upon outstanding educators who are today's superintendents of schools, college presidents, and chairmen of scholarship and fellowship committees, who admit to having been profoundly impressed by this theory.

Like false newspaper stories, they remember the original statement and never have seen the refutation. It sounded so logical and was presented so earnestly when they first heard it that it has greatly strengthened many of their own beliefs, uncritically absorbed through the culture, and still furnishes a background of comfortable, "scientific" justification for many of the decisions they make and the attitudes they hold.

Two or three years ago some of you may have seen a Life magazine presentation of an interesting visual distortion laboratory that has been developed by the psychology department out at The Ohio State University. I spent a morning some time ago having Ross Mooney, who is in charge of it, demonstrate it to me. One is shown a small sized room, for instance, considerably larger than an ordinary doll house sized room. Looking at the room one would say that it is a perfectly ordinary room. The proportions and relationships seem in every way normal. Then I was shown a little toy mouse on one side of the room. I was given a long stick and was invited to put it through the window of the room through which I was looking and chase the mouse over to the other side of the room. As I attempted to reach the mouse with my stick, my arm was surprised to find out how much farther away from me the mouse was than he had seemed to be. And when I attempted to move him over to the other side of the room I found that my arm was forced farther and farther back out of the window. The far corners of the room, although they appeared visually to be equidistant from where I stood, actually were very different distances. Then, although the floor of the room appeared to be level, when a ball was dropped on it, the ball rolled rapidly from one side of the room to the other. The floor simply was not at all level, although my eyes could not believe that it was not. The perspectives and relationships within the room had been so arranged that my eyes were completely fooled. I was strongly tempted to assume that the ball was pulled by a string or that there was some magnetic attraction brought to bear. It was difficult to deny the evidence of visual sense of perspective on which all of us are accustomed to depend so confidently.

Then, as another demonstration, I was asked to sit down, the room was completely darkened and I was asked to watch a tiny little light that was turned on on one of the black immovable walls of the room. Dr. Mooney asked me to tell him what the light did. At first, for a few seconds, the light remained quite stationery. Then, slowly, it began to swing from side to side. Finally, it moved in a circle, round and round. When Dr. Mooney turned the overhead lights on again he let me see that the light which had behaved in such a lively manner, was simply a tiny bulb turned on in back of a little hole bored in the wooden wall of the room. It couldn't possibly have moved. Nor had I floated around in the air in reference to the light. I had simply moved that light by some kind of mechanism of psychological sensation within myself.

Another of the demonstrations, which Dr. Mooney says is shown the student lawyers at Ohio State, proves that sometimes black actually looks white and white looks black and that a witness who swears that black is white might sometimes be telling the truth as he saw it.

After a fairly careful review of any psychological experiments that might seem to have bearing on proving differences between men and women in respect to their participation in human relationships, and the comparatively greater strengths and weaknesses of either sex in these respects, I abandoned this whole approach. It seemed to smack very much of the distortion laboratory at Ohio State University. Every experiment lifted out of total context, with the many complexities that "total context" connotes, might lack only the mouse or the ball to reveal how really phony the set-up was. Then, too, there is always the danger that the investigator himself, without even realizing it, has moved the data around, very much as I unwittingly moved the little light around in Dr. Mooney's laboratory. Or the subjects who have served in some scientific experiment may very well be telling

the truth as they see it in reporting that black is white.

The main conclusion that remains after an examination of the so-called scientific literature comparing men's and women's abilities in human relationships is that role has a great deal to do with "scientific" results. The preconceived notions that the investigator has as to the appropriate, or at least the most commonly played, roles of both men and women, are bound to affect the way an experiment will be focussed. The role of the investigator himself is clearly reflected in the way the experiment is designed. Was it any accident that Thorndike, Pintner and Gates, for instance, were all men, and that Hollingworth was a woman? Wasn't the role that society was permitting each one to play or the roles that society was apparently hindering them from playing getting right into their experimentation and their "scientific" theories? As social and economic conditions change, roles of both men and women are forced to change, and psychological theories change to explain and "prove" something that would not previously have been pertinent nor at all plausible. I remember, for instance, one of my colleagues, undoubtedly one of this country's most eminent psychologists, who, in 1935, consistently explained every child's difficulty as "maternal rejection" just as soon as he could learn that the child's mother held a job outside of her home. In 1935 more than half of all working women were single, but today, with almost one-third of the entire civilian labor force made up of women, and with less than one-third of these women single, somehow it seems pointless to equate a woman's working outside her home with rejection of her children.

And so one's investigation of the assets and liabilities of women in human relationships veers sharply away from the so-called experimental, scientific studies of the comparative abilities of men and women in human relationships, or of abilities having to do with human relationships, and turns toward studies having to do with roles and feelings. And of such literature at present there is no limit. Going back into history one can, of course, find many descriptions for each culture, and for each era, of the appropriate role for the collective womanhood of that time. Usually these roles are limited to some one class of women living at that time in that culture: the Heterai and the female citizens of the time of Pericles in Greece, for instance, were assigned quite different and distinct roles to play. With Freud, however, sex, as such and its role, entered into psychology in a big way. Masculinity and femininity, as stereotypes, took on quite definite and unyielding forms. Many are the arguments that I remember having had in the late 30's and early 40's with orthodox Freudians regarding the feminine role into which they thought every woman had to be fitted--or else. Then, in the late 30's, Karen Horney, with her Neurotic Personality of Our Time, began to undermine the rigid concepts of the masculine and feminine personalities. Horney's great contribution, of course, was in theoretically detaching the role of all women from exclusive biological determination, and in pointing out the powerful role of culture and of the various cultures of various places and various times in shaping personality and permitting endless variation in its forms. We have had floods of books in the past fifteen years, from psychologists, anthropologists, sociologists, and from people who simply like to write, describing and debating the role or roles appropriate and permissible to modern women.

As one reviews the recent books on the roles of modern women--a great many of which, by the way, are written by men--one realizes that many are written with rather narrow perspective, that some are slightly nostalgic, that few have caught up with the rapidly changing conditions that already are determining not what would be nice to have happen with respect to women's lives and roles, but what is going to happen because of the pressures that these conditions have already built up.

Especially when one reads books with which one does not agree, one can sometimes see how dangerously the author has drawn general conclusions from too narrow observations! One is reminded of the man who made the assertion, "All Indians walk in single file." "All Indians?" his friend challenged. "Well, most Indians." "Most Indians?" the friend again asked. "Well, many Indians." "Many Indians always walk in single file?" "Well," he finally admitted, "the one I saw did, the time I saw him."

As one reviews the literature of psychology, especially for the past decade, he is impressed with four facts: (1) that psychology has gone over almost completely to the idea that improved human relations are essential if civilization is to survive: most of the significant work in psychology now starts from that assumption; (2) that psychology in the United States for about fifteen years has been concerned centrally with personality; psychology has stopped trying to measure bits of life and behavior out of context of broader life and behavior; (3) psychology is giving much attention to how personality can be developed through guided experience in human relations so that men and women will be capable of participating in human relations in such a way as to further improve human relations; and (4) psychology has been deeply affected by the American philosophies of pragmatism and instrumentalism.

Kurt Lewin, refugee psychologist from the coercive, totalitarian forces of Germany, seems to me more than any other one person to have taken the lead in this country in the belief that it was both essential and possible for psychology to concentrate on a study of human relations. His classical studies made about fifteen years ago of behavior under conditions of autocracy, laissez faire and democracy were the signal for a whole flock of subsequent studies of the ways in which people relate themselves to each other, why they so relate themselves, and of the consequences in behavior and personality of the quality of their relationships with each other.

Psychological Abstracts, which, since 1927, has presented monthly from 60 to 80 pages of annotated articles and books in the broad fields of psychology, shows quite clearly the big swing that has taken place in psychology in the past fifteen years toward a concern with human relations and with personality and its development. A comparison of the bibliography of Gardner Murphy's book on Personality, written in 1947, with Gordon Allport's, written in 1937, shows clearly the process of rapid accretion that has been going on and the trends that studies of personality have been taking.

The American Council on Education's Commission on Teacher Education, that brought together a group of distinguished educators and psychologists, stated in one of its early reports:

The crucial problem of our times, despite the novel trappings in which it presents itself, is the great eternal problem of man's relations with man. It is the problem of mutual understanding and mutual trust, of agreement on ultimate ends and respect for different ways of seeking these ends, of personal freedom and social unity, of the rational behavior of men as brothers. 1

-
1. The Commission on Teacher Education, The Improvement of Teacher Education. (Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1946), p. 51.
-

And, again,

Citizens in a democracy need to be able to respect themselves and others.... The need for conviction of one's own worth is balanced by the need for appreciation of the worth of others. Self-respect is only a special case of respect for humanity.....

Man's need for success in social relationships is great. It is important that he should understand and accept the inescapably social character of his existence. As a matter of fact, the satisfactions that flow from successful human relations are essential to wholesome personality development....

At each stage personal satisfaction requires giving as well as receiving: it is not enough to sense the affectionate responsiveness of others; the individual also needs to feel certain that he, too, is making a worthy contribution to the relationship. It is difficult to overestimate the ballasting effect on personality of a series of successful give-and-take friendships of the sort suggested. The school should be a place in which relationships of this character are nurtured. 2.

This was the theme that ran through all of this important commission.

-
2. Commission on Teacher Education, Teachers for Our Times. (Washington, D.C. The American Council on Education, 1944), pp. 117-118.
-

One can pick up almost at random books and articles written within the past ten years by psychologists and educators in their more philosophical moments and find statements like the following:

....Our Western civilization can be saved to become vigorous and healthy in the future only if the basic authoritarian human relationships are rejected, abandoned, eliminated wherever they may be operating. To replace them, it wants to use cooperative human relations as the basic climate of opinion and process by which to resolve or solve all problems of living among ourselves and with other people....This cooperative process respects individuality, develops intelligence, promotes creativeness, and matures personality to the point where thoughtful, deliberative, human action can replace the less human, less intelligent, and socially less valuable power controls.

....The dominant direction of our culture must be changed immediately and effectively from authoritarian to cooperative human relations....The schools, educators, parents, and the public can play an important part in bringing about such a change. 3

-
3. L. Thomas Hopkins, "The Need is Great, the Time is Now." Teachers College Record, 50, No. 2 (November, 1948), p. 85.
-

There seems plenty of evidence that psychology is deeply concerned with the problem of human relationships, but I can find no evidence anywhere that psychology thinks this concern should affect men and women differently. Psychology is taking the position that everyone is in this business of human relations together;

everyone must be concerned; everyone must work at it together with everyone else; that is the crux of the matter. If everyone does not work at it--and successfully--there is a real chance that not only civilization but the whole human race will perish.

In the psychology of personality what seem to be the great themes? These take two forms: descriptions of the basic dynamics of personality, and attempts to discover and analyze the experiences and influences that most directly affect personality organization.

Karen Horney and Erich Fromm well illustrate the way in which psychologists have been attempting to describe personality in terms, basically, of human relationships. Horney says in Our Inner Conflicts⁴ that each of us tends to develop one of four characteristic ways of relating to others. One may characteristically attempt to relate to others, or feel most comfortable, in a dominating relationship. Horney sees this sort of personality reaction as the externalizing of feelings of hate; she describes it as "moving against" others and says that other-selves come to be regarded by such a personality as inferior to self. A desire to be dominant over others is a very commonly-seen basis on which many people attempt to establish their relationships with others. It is so often seen that it is quite taken for granted by most of us. As a matter of fact, this attitude has seemed to gain so much for those who practice it successfully that it attracts much admiration and tends to stimulate emulation. It has seemed to be a highly rewarding game to see whether one could not learn to out-dominate one's dominators. Aggression, personal power and even ruthlessness have seemed to many to pay off--and probably they do when everyone more or less accepts this as the game that is being played and gets in on it in some role or other--thereby, of course, further maintaining the game itself.

Horney points out another way that is characteristically used by some people in relating to others. These people feel more comfortable in submitting to, in placating, in agreeing with and conforming to others. They feel dependent and fit into "the competitive game" mentioned above in indispensable roles. Those who enjoy exercising dominance are willing to be very nice to these submissive ones who furnish them a free field for their aggressive impulses.

There is another kind of person who simply withdraws, who goes off to paint or write or perform some other operation by himself--who wishes neither to dominate nor to submit but is happier merely in moving off some place where he won't be bothered by other people. He is quite willing to leave the field entirely, to leave it to those who pit their strength against each other and to those who are willing to pay the price of submission for not having to do constant battle.

Psychology is pointing out with increasing clarity that the dominant, the submissive, and the withdrawing are all using ways of relating to others that not only are not productive of a really good society, but also that these are adjustments of less-than-well-adjusted persons.

The really well-adjusted person is able to feel with others; to work, not so much for others as with them; does not make others feel they work for so much as with him. In Horney's language, he moves not against, nor toward, nor away from, but rather with others. This kind of person has little hostility that drives him against others, little anxiety and fear; he has a large capacity to accept others and to relate himself to them in a truly cooperative relationship.

4. Karen Horney. Our Inner Conflicts. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc. 1945), pp. 73-94.

Ashley Montague optimistically points out:

We begin to understand then that evolution itself is a process which favors cooperating rather than disoperating groups, and "fitness" is a function of the group as a whole rather than of separate individuals. The fitness of the individual is largely derived from his membership in a group. The more cooperative the group, the greater is the fitness for survival which extends to all its members.

The important point to grasp is that, contrary to the beliefs of the struggle-for-survival school of thought, man does not have to create a cooperative mood for himself....The impulses toward cooperative behavior are already present in him at birth, and all they require is cultivation. There is not a shred of evidence that man is born with "hostile" or "evil" impulses which must be watched and disciplined. Discipline of basic impulses is, indeed, necessary but it is the discipline of love, not of frustration, which they require. 5

5. Ashley Montague. On Being Human. (New York: Henry Schuman, 1950) pp. 45-46.

Erich Fromm is one of the many psychologists who stresses the point that one cannot love others if he does not love himself.

....love for and understanding of one's own self, cannot be separated from respect for and love and understanding of another individual. The love for my own self is inseparably connected with the love for any other self....

The affirmation of one's own life, happiness, growth, freedom, is rooted in one's capacity to love, i.e., in care, respect, responsibility, and knowledge. If an individual is able to love productively, he loves himself too; if he can love only others, he can not love at all. 6

6. Eric Fromm, Man for Himself. (N.Y.: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1947), pp. 29-30

Psychologists obviously believe that many of the central problems of our time--war, exploitive economic relations, divorce, mental illness--among others--are connected directly with the ways that individuals feel about themselves and the ways they have learned to relate themselves to others. And since it is such problems as these that are tearing down society it indeed behooves us to enquire deeply how we can educate for more constructive human relations.

The literature on developmental psychology and parent-child relations is bursting with descriptions of how early experience in human relationships with his parents conditions permanently the personality of each child. A worthwhile effort is the attempt by Robert Havighurst and others to analyze and describe the developmental tasks, accomplished largely in terms of relationships, that progressively determine the personality outcome of each person as he grows up and, consequently, his ability in human relations.

Psychologists have definitely deserted a position of moral neutrality. In their deep concern that psychology shall contribute to the making of a good society and to the development of well-adjusted, socially productive persons, this is quite clear. American psychologists today are predominantly activists: they

are not satisfied merely to know; they wish also to have psychology change individual behavior and feeling and social policy and action. Psychology carries on today in the best tradition of pragmatism and instrumentalism.

This is shown by the tremendous growth of counseling and psychotherapy; by the fascinating development over the past ten years of the field of group dynamics; by the way in which psychology has entered into the industrial life of America; by the way in which education and psychology work in close alliance.

One of the most interesting of the doctoral studies I have seen for some time is one by Alma Hawkins of George Williams College. She studies the ways in which the educational use of modern dance can contribute to the development of those who practice it. She draws ably on psychosomatics to show how the development of the body can contribute to the development of personality; on the psychology of personality to show how an improved self concept can contribute to an enlarged capacity for constructive feelings toward others; and on the fields of group development and group dynamics to show the many opportunities that exist in any dance situation for practicing and learning improved ways of relating together in groups.

And now, although I have been able to say a good deal about the approach that modern psychology is taking to the problem of human relationships, I have not been able to show that psychology is differentiating much as to the assets and liabilities of men and women in human relations. And yet there obviously are some differences. Women in our culture at this time unquestionably have more opportunity than men, on the whole, to influence the very first ways that babies will feel about themselves and about others. Psychology says that this is an extremely important opportunity that women have and that it is important for them to learn how to use it wisely. Women, in larger numbers than men, are teachers of young children in pre-school and elementary school situations. It is important that teachers learn increasingly how to use for improved human relations the rich opportunities that such situations provide. By and large, as one looks at the colleges and universities of the country, it is evident that women students under the leadership of women deans have developed student government in terms of human relations much further than have men students under the leadership of men deans. Similarly, it has been women's colleges, and women's residence halls in coeducational colleges that have consistently taken the lead under women educators in developing living situations that are meant to educate for fine human relations. It has been women's educational organizations like the American Association of University Women and the National Association of Deans of Women which have always given attention to the important educational opportunities--opportunities for education in human relations--that inhere in residence halls, student activities, social life and in other aspects of the college as a community.

A group like this would know far better than I the extent to which it is true, but certainly it has always seemed quite clear to me that women professionally trained for leadership in physical education were more sensitively and consistently concerned with personality development of individuals and education in human relations than were most of the men I have known in this field. Certainly, the quite different programs of health and physical education for men and for women in most institutions represent far more than a recognition of biological differences. Perhaps, just as residence halls programs for men have tended to improve in those places where A.A.U.W. has insisted that the residence halls program for women should be better, physical education programs for men are benefited by the fact that women's physical education programs are free to be different and to explore human relations values and possibilities for personality development that are richly inherent in such programs.

But, as far as psychology is concerned, one must be very cautious about generalizing as to the assets and liabilities of women in human relations. Are women by nature really more interested in persons than in things? Are women more interested and competent in handling the kind of intimate detail that goes into the determination of personality, and less interested and competent in handling large problems of social organization and process? Is that why women still have so little to do with politics, but why so many of them turn to teaching little children? Or is it that women are by nature less aggressive in human relations than are men, and so tend in the kind of competitive society that we have to be submerged over and over again? If women tend, by nature, to be submissive more often than they are dominant can they learn any more quickly than the more dominant male how to feel and behave cooperatively? What are the problems of converting from an authoritarian personality to a cooperative one? Are they greater or less than in converting from a submissive personality to a cooperative one? Should education be concerned to educate deeply (in terms of emotional feeling and social behavior as well as in terms of intellectual ideas and beliefs) in the realm of human relations, or should we leave the matter to other agencies and count on psychotherapy to correct emotional illnesses and inadequacies, if satisfactory learning does not take place?

These are all problems which are being studied. I feel that thus far there are no dependable answers. We all operate in a dynamic, changing society. We have constant revelations of how inadequate it is to offer glib explanations of almost anything based on biological sex differences. We know that as society changes the roles of each person in that society have a tendency to shift. Thus far there seems to be a great deal of opportunity for thoughtful, strong, moral individuals--men and women--to exert influence on human relationships to exert this influence through their homes and the kind of relationships they develop in their families; through their relationships with their children; through their relationships with others in their work situations; very marked opportunities through education; opportunities through their neighborhoods and broader communities; through church membership; and through intelligent exercise of their citizenship duties. And all of this influence and the way it is used will add up to having more people who feel more hostile and aggressive, or more dependent, or more withdrawn, or more truly cooperative than we have at present. And more people who know how to make society more and more competitive, or how to make it more authoritarian, or how to make it more cooperative and truly free.

Each of us, according to her own personality and her own understanding, has assets and liabilities for exercising influence in the direction of changed human relationships. It seems to me to come down pretty much to a matter of emotional adjustment, social understanding, and moral strength what kind of influence each of us will have on the human relationships of her time.

OPEN FORUM DISCUSSION

(Following Address by Dr. Lloyd-Jones)

Question: Is there any experimental research which would tend to either refute or prove that a person or persons who dominate in one area of relationships tend to dominate in another area?

Dr. Jones: I remember an interesting little study that was told to me in a conversation with the Personnel Director of a large department store. This was shortly after the war when the store was concerned about the impoliteness of the clerks to the customers and were trying to do something about courtesy. The Personnel Director had a hunch which he decided he would try out. It developed that the President came in to his office late one morning. He was annoyed because something had gone wrong. He called in his first assistant and gave him a tongue lashing--and told him thus and so. The man went out and gave somebody else the same kind of bawling out that he had gotten and that person gave it to somebody else. Each person took it and transmitted it on down until finally a clerk was rude to a customer; the customer withdrew her account. There wasn't any evidence around that the President had actually lost the account until the Personnel Director was able to trace the chain of rudeness back up to its source on that day.

I can remember courses for personnel workers in which you are taught to learn to take pressure and aggression but not to pass it on. Well, what does it do in terms of you? What you do with it after you get it and do not pass it on has not been fully explored.

Comment from the floor:

There is research being conducted by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company on accident prevention as related to the built-up of inner tension which is set free as the individual moves into that going home period which is the heavy accident period.

Question: What is the price of competition in a cooperative society?

Dr. Jones: There is a place, isn't there, for competition? Competition and striving in an attempt to excel or to improve are pretty closely related. I have been thinking about the function of competition in the physical education sports program. I can imagine that competition as found in the sports program with the opportunity that it provides for occasional talks with students about how competition makes them feel, and what they do about the feelings competition arouses, might be somewhat the equivalent of our play therapy with young children. Through play, children can get rid of their aggression without being fought back at and consequently are less afraid of themselves and less afraid of their own impulses; they know what it feels like to really smash things up, to use everything they've got just as hard as they can against something else. They aren't so fearful of feelings of anger afterwards; they know what destruction is and perhaps they don't need it so much; they know how to handle it within themselves; they know what to do with it. I think it would be very interesting to explore the differential effect that competition might have in various people in relation to their personality needs, how they feel about themselves, how they feel about others, therefore, what significance for their own emotional feeling competition has.

Question: Do you think it might be desirable for us to direct this spirit of competition more against ourselves, towards self improvement rather than measuring ourselves against someone else by attempting to become superior over someone else?

Dr. Jones: Don't you think though that this other may be worth exploring for certain kinds of people? You see, there are certain kinds of people who if they are helped to direct their feelings of competition against themselves would do it in a destructive way. You have to be cautious about that. It would be good for them, wouldn't it, really to compete against others and to realize that, in general, for everybody it was all in fun and to have it sort of decontaminated for them in that way. They need to be able to compete with themselves without tearing themselves to pieces by the way in which they would do it.

Comment from the floor: I believe we have some evidence that students can come through an intra-mural experience and competition with other girls on the college level, through even an intense experience in competition, with increased understanding of what competition is all about in terms of the feelings of the other group. In other words, I think we are trying to do a job in teaching of competition by providing good experience in competition. When we talk of competition at the elementary school level we have now some evidence that the parents, not the coaches, are the ones who want that highly competitive experience for the children. In one study, when the experimenter compared the opinions of parents from P.T.A.'s, of room teachers, of administrators, and of coaches, the least favorable to intensive competition at the level of these little children were the coaches, including women coaches, too. The most favorable were the parents--those parents, those mothers, appear to want glory for their children. They don't know a thing about what this terrific competition does to their young children, either physically or emotionally.

Miss Baker: We think we can do something through leadership in our field, and I think our usual way of going at it is to say these are the things we want done, these are the duties we want performed and then we leap on the first person we see with initiative to carry out the things to be done. We should be not only testing our duties and functions that we want performed but we should be thinking carefully about the different types of personality in trying to tie in the duties with the type of program. We should be studying our people and setting up a hierarchy of experiences, shouldn't we, of different levels of leadership suited to the people that we have?

Dr. Jones: I just wrote an article on this business of leadership and I think that the very thing that you do in terms of hierarchies of leadership illustrates that so much of our thinking about leadership is in terms of who is superior to whom. Who, therefore, can exert the most pressure and who is at the bottom and gets the most pressure? That is one whole thought system that we have for dealing with the business of leadership. That is status leadership. There is also the expert leader, the one who in respect to one trait is better, further out. I believe we think horizontally about some kinds of leaders. Further away on a scale, outside or away from the great mass who have the same quality only at a very ordinary level and that sort is the expert leader. Then there is also an Atlas leader, a person who feels that it all rests upon him and he can delegate only so far as he can find people who will carry

out exactly the thing that he sees must be done. The Atlas person feels that he is responsible and he will pull back his delegation of duties and responsibilities the instant that a person is not an adequate instrument for his use. There is also the chain-reaction leader who exercises leadership. This is the educator, the good educator, and I think, also the good administrative leader, the good any kind of leader who wants to develop in other people the ability to grow to have this quality of leadership so that they, in turn, can pass it on to others, to new leaders who will not want to keep leadership all for themselves. It is a sort of chain-reaction effect which good leadership tries to set off. I believe a good teacher sees that quite clearly, and I don't know why it is not fundamentally exactly the same concept if we translate our knowledge into group development, group dynamics, personality development, exactly the same concept carries over into administration, into human relationships of all sorts; that is real leadership, I think, democratic leadership. If we could look at the status leadership concepts that we use in building people up apart from others or away from others or the Atlas kind of leadership idea and critically evaluate them and work toward the other kind of concept--the chain reaction leadership, I think it opens up vitally interesting possibilities in human relations.

DISCUSSION GROUPS
(Following Address by Dr. Lloyd-Jones)

General Education Group

1. What responsibility does general education have, and physical education in particular, for providing guided experience in good human relations?
2. How can we develop desirable leadership qualities in our students, and how can we evaluate the example which we as leaders are setting?
3. How can physical education contribute to a curriculum of "developmental tasks"?
4. Assuming that the contribution of the individual to human relations is dependent upon individual emotional adjustment, social adjustment, and moral strength, how can physical education foster these qualities?
5. What are the peculiar possibilities of a physical education program for developing "skills for contact"?
6. In our physical education activities, how can we encourage attitudes of "moving toward" people, this contact skill being "The only one proper for a productive society"?
7. What steps do we as physical educators need to take to educate ourselves about a psychology of human relations?

Teacher Education Group

Midget competition. All were opposed in principal, but concerned with the source of the phenomenon. Maladjusted parents? Commercial sponsorship? Spectatoritis? Education's lack of attention to the child's needs and interests?

Inter-school competition condemned and praised. Canada has excellent plan for three colleges.

Inter-sex competition a problem with best athletes in a teacher training school.

The desirability of having a married woman on the staff was mentioned. Also the value of having a parent in the group. Some objection was made in favor of the single teachers who of necessity must bear the brunt of early and late assignments. However, that could be adjusted.

As a result of the emphasis on human relationships much discussion centered around inter-department problems, the isolation of the Physical Education department.

The difficulty of "selling" some of Physical Education standards should yield to efforts keyed to better understanding of the mores of the adolescent, and also to a better orientation on the part of the student.

The point was made that we are as a group emotionally attached to our field and correspondingly ignorant of other fields. Correlation needs to come from both sides. Even within our field we are attached to our special interest. For example Sports-minded people look askance at Dance etc. There is rivalry for prestige financial appropriations, administrative favors.

We must keep constantly before the students and faculty the essential common purpose of all areas of education.

INTRODUCTION OF MRS. OLIVE REMINGTON GOLDMAN

Mrs. Olive Remington Goldman is the United States Representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. In addition, Mrs. Goldman is Assistant Director for Women's Affairs and Volunteer Manpower in the Federal Civil Defense Administration with headquarters in the Chicago Regional Office. Mrs. Goldman has recently come from the meetings of the United Nations in Europe and brings to us the latest thinking of the group on the status of women. It is a pleasure to present to you this distinguished representative of our country. Mrs. Goldman.

WOMEN'S RESPONSIBILITY IN THE WORLD CRISIS

OLIVE REMINGTON GOLDMAN

Madam Chairman, Professor Baker, Dean Elliot and leaders of the Wellesley Alumnae:

Your chairman was far too kind! However, Governor Stevenson of Illinois said once after a most complimentary introduction, "Flattery's fine so long as you don't inhale." I held my breath while she was talking!

I am extremely happy to be able to be here today. I was very much pleased and flattered to be asked. It is many a year since I have been on the Wellesley Campus and the last time was as a stage director in a Harvard '47 Work Shop performance in the "Barn." I have never forgotten that enthusiastic audience and I have been anxious to talk at Wellesley ever since.

When I heard you were going to do a tape recording, Professor Baker, I was pleased that I did not have to read a script. But since my experience in correcting the "provisional" summary records of a hectic session at the United Nations in Geneva, I know that I do not always speak "in periods."

This Spring at the Palais des Nations the Provisional Summary Records were taken down in French and then translated into English and often seemed very remote indeed from my original remarks. I also found myself always hyphenated as "Mrs. Remington-Goldman."

The title on your program may seem a rather presumptuous and pompous one. And yet this particular symposium has produced it. You are a peculiarly appealing audience because of your primary interest in Physical Education. The psychologists, the anthropologist, and the general plan that all of you are concentrating on--how to bring together and diffuse the demands upon the physical and the spiritual of all women stimulates the hope that you may bring to fruition and your students, both the wisdom and the sense of balance which will pay off in solving the problems of the complicated world in which we now live.

Coming to you as I do quite fresh from a U.N. meeting in Europe--our Commission of the Status of Women meeting in April, and a State Department assignment that followed through central Europe, and then the government Staff College on Civilian Defense in England--I find that I have encountered repeatedly mistaken terms and conflicts which must be cleared away before talking of this "women business." Among both feminists and anti-feminists there is a conflict between the demands for rights on one hand, and an unwillingness to assume responsibilities on the other. The other thing that I think needs to be clarified is that there is a constant tendency among men and women to confuse the problem of equality with identity of treatment. Equality does not necessarily imply identity of treatment between the sexes.

I had three rather interesting examples of what I mean after the Status Commission met. In Austria I spent a great deal of time with the different political groups, both men's and women's, in Labor, Education and the Professions with governors and burgemeisters. I found that all of Austria was talking about the efforts in the conservative party to change their family laws. Curiously enough, it was the men of the party who thought

there should be a change, so that in every Austrian family the wife should be co-equal with the man before the law as head of the family, and it should no longer be the man alone who has complete control of all decisions; for example, of how the children should be educated.

To my amazement, the women's groups were opposing this idea with the remark: "Never! There would be chaos if there were two heads!"

One wondered a little bit whether those clever Viennese women were not afraid that if they assumed co-headship, technically, (I think most of them are in reality acting heads of their families) the men might evade some of their responsibility as breadwinners.

Another thing I ran into at the Status meetings was the need to explain to certain delegates why the U.S. was opposed to and had laws in some states prohibiting women from working underground. Some felt this was discrimination against women! I also, of course, ran into this criticism from all Communist delegates, because their contention is that women should work at all the hardest tasks in the country, as they most certainly do in the U.S.S.R.!

In trying to explain it, I fell back upon the problem of how we dress for such jobs. I pointed out that when my three daughters were out during the War to help with the corn crop, detasselling corn in the fields of Illinois, they wore blue jeans. Whereas you look at the picture of women working in Russia and you see them, for example, pouring hot asphalt in the streets of Moscow, clad in flapping, flimsy cotton skirts. I used that example to indicate that in this country we don't consider pouring asphalt or puddling steel, or digging coal, a woman's job. All of this and even heavier and more hazardous work is done in Russia by the women. If they resist assignment to such work, they can be penalized in many ways--even to depriving their babies of milk!

When I got back to New York I was surprised to find the same argument raging at the Human Rights Commission. The Human Rights Commission was split on whether they should write into the Human Rights Covenant, special rights for women.

My first job in the U.N. in '49 had been on the Human Rights Commission and talk for status in behalf of the anti-discrimination article which says there should be no discrimination because of race, color, creed or sex which was maintained. Yet at the meeting here in New York this last month, it was the men of the Commission (there were only three women--Mrs. Russell, of Sweden; our own Mrs. Roosevelt; and Hansa Mehta, of India) who said, "Let's write women's rights into the various articles about politics, equal pay, etc." Although the three women on the Commission resisted that viewpoint as gallantry, they were over-ruled, and specific rights for women were spelled out. I have always maintained that women, also, are people, and did not see why they should be especially mentioned when they had already been included in the basic Anti-discrimination Article.

The reason I am bringing this up is that I have the feeling that here at Wellesley you have avoided that particular pitfall. I do not think you have that kind of worry or struggle for "Rights." I do think, however, since I have been a teacher too, that all of us have the problem of persuading our students and the young people with whom we have contact that we must shoulder responsibilities in the world today.

One of the reasons I wanted to come here, Dr. Elliott, is that I had heard so much about this school from my friend, Professor Florence Lawson, who may have been known to many of you when she studied here. She has just retired at the

University of Illinois, and the dinner that was given for her last fall as tribute from faculty and students, is a thing I shall always remember. She was one of the most beloved and brilliant teachers at Illinois and she has made a lasting impression on our teachers and young people.

It isn't an easy thing that we are trying to do. Modern life itself is complicated, but the life of any woman in this day and age who is conscientiously interested in public affairs, is enormously involved. It isn't only a double responsibility either, because every single one of us are homemakers, many of us, also, are married and have young families. If we don't have children we have our aged to take care of, or our husbands, and many of us have a triple or a quadruple duty in community work, or jobs, or world affairs. And that takes a very special kind of ability and understanding, and team work such as we heard described in that very brilliant talk this morning, to do justice, as we must, to such varied demands.

I think our problem boils down to the question of whether American women are really going to be on the job when things begin to happen--and as our defenses--physical and spiritual shape up. I think we have great power to maintain peace if we really shoulder our responsibilities. That is the reason I am on leave from a Welfare Job, working in Federal Civilian Defense, because I think if we get organized to face the possibility of atom attacks, we are far less apt to get them! We know that the Russians have 40,000,000 involved in active civil defense. They are drafting their people into it. The Swedish have one out of every seven of their people in their defense force, and so far, we have very, very few of the 15,000,000 needed for adequate C. D. operations. That's one of the reasons I think women have got to be more alert to the particular dangers on our horizon, because I think if we are prepared, we are far less apt to be attacked. And so we may have gained more and more time to build the world we want and the peace we hope will come eventually.

I will tell you something of what has been happening in the U.N. Status affairs, because I think it reflects the way women are taking on responsibilities around the world. You know this Commission was set up six years ago to try and rid the world of discriminations against women in the fields of politics, employment, education, etc. There have been two very interesting demonstrations of the intense interest in this Commission within the last year. For one, the membership was increased from 15 to 18, because of the demand from various countries who wanted their women in. Also, the General Assembly, quite surprisingly, by a vote of 40 to 10, recommended that the Economic and Social Council keep the Commission on an annual schedule because it felt its work was so important. The only other Commission permanently on that basis is Human Rights.

Now the things that evolved out of the last meeting of the Status Commission in Geneva were rather interesting. For one thing, in increasing the membership to 18 we had 11 new members on the Commission, and those of you who work on committees, on a Board of Education, or Board of Trustees, etc., know something of what eleven new members in the body of 18 will do to a meeting. It meant a terrific burden of work for those of us who had had previous experience in the Agenda, and in U.N. procedure.

We faced there, also, the same problem that you feel in every U.N. meeting around the world--the conflict between the communists and those who still believe in freedom. I had to resist the Communist attack by myself for quite a long time, because the U.K. delegate, Mary Sutherland (and it is quite a tribute to England that Churchill sent their leading Labor women as a delegate to the Commission) was very late in getting there due to other obligations in her country; and the French delegate, our choice for Chairman was presiding. (Usually the U.S.S.R. and the other Iron Curtain delegates concentrated their criticism upon the three of us.)

The Russian delegate was making a long speech, one of her usual ones, as Mary Sutherland came in and sat down rather wearily. Finally as the Russian, Madame Popova, stopped speaking, Miss Sutherland reached for the microphone and told the Commission in her Scotch burr how sorry she was that she had missed four days of the meeting, "But," she said, "As I came in just now, I thought I was back in Beirut five years ago, or in New York last year, because, believe it or not, Madame Popova is making the same speech she was making then, and it certainly has not improved with r-r-r-repetition!"

But all the Russian speeches were not the same this year. The English delegate had missed the first and very stormy session, where we had heard not only the usual attack on the U.S., but an attack on all the work that had been done in the Commission which was termed "Useless" by the Russian delegate; and then a vehement charge that the United States had been committing terrible atrocities against women and children in Korea. (That awful W.I.D.F. report which some of you may have seen, which is entirely discredited, was brought up) And after that the accusation that we were using bacteriological warfare in North Korea! I expected the charge. I was almost certain we were going to get it, and I had with me the "Command" reports from Korea and I had all the refutation I needed. I found that the Communists do not like to be reminded that they have repeatedly refused impartial investigation by the International Red Cross of any of these false charges; nor, do they like the suggestion that they should check the aggressors in Korea. And, to my great amazement, they never raised the atrocity, nor the "Germ Warfare" issue again before the Commission at this session.

I have found that a swift and direct rebuttal, which shows the U.S.S.R. that you can make counter-communist propaganda will often turn them off. In one session in '51, I won three days' complete freedom from communist attacks--by a vigorous counterattack. We got on with our business then, and that is what is important!

Mary Sutherland missed that opening show, but she was there for the rest of it and I was certainly glad to have her. She is an eloquent and experienced debator.

Of course, the prime interest in that commission is political rights for women. When I first went on the commission I was reminded that our Government doesn't like international conventions (which is U.N. language for treaties). Yet, I felt that the United States, having full political rights for women, should back the countries that do not yet have them by trying to give them the means they thought would be most effective to get them, i.e., U.N. a "Convention" on Political Rights. So, I got permission from our Government (we are instructed delegates always, you know) to help draft such a convention. I could not vote for the third article the women wanted which calls for political rights for women to be appointed to public office, because our Legal Department in Washington says that appointed officers means also officers of the U.S. Army and Navy, and women cannot be drafted or go into combat duty; therefore, we cannot back a treaty which says, "appointive office." I pointed out that we have a woman brigadier general, head of our nursing service, and we have many women of high rank. Come another--an atomic--war, there will be no distinction as to sex! In England, you will remember, women started out as plane spotters, but before long they were firing the anti-aircraft guns. And so will we if the bombers come over. But that is the way it stood. I was, however, able to help the Convention along. It will go to the General Assembly this Fall, and although the wording isn't perfect and the U.S. had to abstain on Article 3, still it is a step ahead. If women can vote and be elected to public office, then they can take care of the things that are wrong in the laws of their own countries. That is, they should, as they gain political maturity. Women have the deciding voice in elections in this country; yet, I am afraid we don't always use our vote as effectively as we could.

are not satisfied merely to know; they wish also to have psychology change individual behavior and feeling and social policy and action. Psychology carries on today in the best tradition of pragmatism and instrumentalism.

This is shown by the tremendous growth of counseling and psychotherapy; by the fascinating development over the past ten years of the field of group dynamics; by the way in which psychology has entered into the industrial life of America; by the way in which education and psychology work in close alliance.

One of the most interesting of the doctoral studies I have seen for some time is one by Alma Hawkins of George Williams College. She studies the ways in which the educational use of modern dance can contribute to the development of those who practice it. She draws ably on psychosomatics to show how the development of the body can contribute to the development of personality; on the psychology of personality to show how an improved self concept can contribute to an enlarged capacity for constructive feelings toward others; and on the fields of group development and group dynamics to show the many opportunities that exist in any dance situation for practicing and learning improved ways of relating together in groups.

And now, although I have been able to say a good deal about the approach that modern psychology is taking to the problem of human relationships, I have not been able to show that psychology is differentiating much as to the assets and liabilities of men and women in human relations. And yet there obviously are some differences. Women in our culture at this time unquestionably have more opportunity than men, on the whole, to influence the very first ways that babies will feel about themselves and about others. Psychology says that this is an extremely important opportunity that women have and that it is important for them to learn how to use it wisely. Women, in larger numbers than men, are teachers of young children in pre-school and elementary school situations. It is important that teachers learn increasingly how to use for improved human relations the rich opportunities that such situations provide. By and large, as one looks at the colleges and universities of the country, it is evident that women students under the leadership of women deans have developed student government in terms of human relations much further than have men students under the leadership of men deans. Similarly, it has been women's colleges, and women's residence halls in coeducational colleges that have consistently taken the lead under women educators in developing living situations that are meant to educate for fine human relations. It has been women's educational organizations like the American Association of University Women and the National Association of Deans of Women which have always given attention to the important educational opportunities--opportunities for education in human relations--that inhere in residence halls, student activities, social life and in other aspects of the college as a community.

A group like this would know far better than I the extent to which it is true, but certainly it has always seemed quite clear to me that women professionally trained for leadership in physical education were more sensitively and consistently concerned with personality development of individuals and education in human relations than were most of the men I have known in this field. Certainly, the quite different programs of health and physical education for men and for women in most institutions represent far more than a recognition of biological differences. Perhaps, just as residence halls programs for men have tended to improve in those places where A.A.U.W. has insisted that the residence halls program for women should be better, physical education programs for men are benefited by the fact that women's physical education programs are free to be different and to explore human relations values and possibilities for personality development that are richly inherent in such programs.

But, as far as psychology is concerned, one must be very cautious about generalizing as to the assets and liabilities of women in human relations. Are women by nature really more interested in persons than in things? Are women more interested and competent in handling the kind of intimate detail that does into the determination of personality, and less interested and competent in handling large problems of social organization and process? Is that why women still have so little to do with politics, but why so many of them turn to teaching little children? Or is it that women are by nature less aggressive in human relations than are men, and so tend in the kind of competitive society that we have to be submerged over and over again? If women tend, by nature, to be submissive more often than they are dominant can they learn any more quickly than the more dominant male how to feel and behave cooperatively? What are the problems of converting from an authoritarian personality to a cooperative one? Are they greater or less than in converting from a submissive personality to a cooperative one? Should education be concerned to educate deeply (in terms of emotional feeling and social behavior as well as in terms of intellectual ideas and beliefs) in the realm of human relations, or should we leave the matter to other agencies and count on psychotherapy to correct emotional illnesses and inadequacies, if satisfactory learning does not take place?

These are all problems which are being studied. I feel that thus far there are no dependable answers. We all operate in a dynamic, changing society. We have constant revelations of how inadequate it is to offer glib explanations of almost anything based on biological sex differences. We know that as society changes the roles of each person in that society have a tendency to shift. Thus far there seems to be a great deal of opportunity for thoughtful, strong, moral individuals--men and women--to exert influence on human relationships to exert this influence through their homes and the kind of relationships they develop in their families; through their relationships with their children; through their relationships with others in their work situations; very marked opportunities through education; opportunities through their neighborhoods and broader communities; through church membership; and through intelligent exercise of their citizenship duties. And all of this influence and the way it is used will add up to having more people who feel more hostile and aggressive, or more dependent, or more withdrawn, or more truly cooperative than we have at present. And more people who know how to make society more and more competitive, or how to make it more authoritarian, or how to make it more cooperative and truly free.

Each of us, according to her own personality and her own understanding, has assets and liabilities for exercising influence in the direction of changed human relationships. It seems to me to come down pretty much to a matter of emotional adjustment, social understanding, and moral strength what kind of influence each of us will have on the human relationships of her time.

But, as far as psychology is concerned, one must be very cautious about generalizing as to the assets and liabilities of women in human relations. Are women by nature really more interested in persons than in things? Are women more interested and competent in handling the kind of intimate detail that does into the determination of personality, and less interested and competent in handling large problems of social organization and process? Is that why women still have so little to do with politics, but why so many of them turn to teaching little children? Or is it that women are by nature less aggressive in human relations than are men, and so tend in the kind of competitive society that we have to be submerged over and over again? If women tend, by nature, to be submissive more often than they are dominant can they learn any more quickly than the more dominant male how to feel and behave cooperatively? What are the problems of converting from an authoritarian personality to a cooperative one? Are they greater or less than in converting from a submissive personality to a cooperative one? Should education be concerned to educate deeply (in terms of emotional feeling and social behavior as well as in terms of intellectual ideas and beliefs) in the realm of human relations, or should we leave the matter to other agencies and count on psychotherapy to correct emotional illnesses and inadequacies, if satisfactory learning does not take place?

These are all problems which are being studied. I feel that thus far there are no dependable answers. We all operate in a dynamic, changing society. We have constant revelations of how inadequate it is to offer glib explanations of almost anything based on biological sex differences. We know that as society changes the roles of each person in that society have a tendency to shift. Thus far there seems to be a great deal of opportunity for thoughtful, strong, moral individuals--men and women--to exert influence on human relationships to exert this influence through their homes and the kind of relationships they develop in their families; through their relationships with their children; through their relationships with others in their work situations; very marked opportunities through education; opportunities through their neighborhoods and broader communities; through church membership; and through intelligent exercise of their citizenship duties. And all of this influence and the way it is used will add up to having more people who feel more hostile and aggressive, or more dependent, or more withdrawn, or more truly cooperative than we have at present. And more people who know how to make society more and more competitive, or how to make it more authoritarian, or how to make it more cooperative and truly free.

Each of us, according to her own personality and her own understanding, has assets and liabilities for exercising influence in the direction of changed human relationships. It seems to me to come down pretty much to a matter of emotional adjustment, social understanding, and moral strength what kind of influence each of us will have on the human relationships of her time.

OPEN FORUM DISCUSSION

(Following Address by Dr. Lloyd-Jones)

Question: Is there any experimental research which would tend to either refute or prove that a person or persons who dominate in one area of relationships tend to dominate in another area?

Dr. Jones: I remember an interesting little study that was told to me in a conversation with the Personnel Director of a large department store. This was shortly after the war when the store was concerned about the impoliteness of the clerks to the customers and were trying to do something about courtesy. The Personnel Director had a hunch which he decided he would try out. It developed that the President came in to his office late one morning. He was annoyed because something had gone wrong. He called in his first assistant and gave him a tongue lashing--and told him thus and so. The man went out and gave somebody else the same kind of bawling out that he had gotten and that person gave it to somebody else. Each person took it and transmitted it on down until finally a clerk was rude to a customer; the customer withdrew her account. There wasn't any evidence around that the President had actually lost the account until the Personnel Director was able to trace the chain of rudeness back up to its source on that day.

I can remember courses for personnel workers in which you are taught to learn to take pressure and aggression but not to pass it on. Well, what does it do in terms of you? What you do with it after you get it and do not pass it on has not been fully explored.

Comment from the floor: There is research being conducted by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company on accident prevention as related to the built-up of inner tension which is set free as the individual moves into that going home period which is the heavy accident period.

Question: What is the price of competition in a cooperative society?

Dr. Jones: There is a place, isn't there, for competition? Competition and striving in an attempt to excel or to improve are pretty closely related. I have been thinking about the function of competition in the physical education sports program. I can imagine that competition as found in the sports program with the opportunity that it provides for occasional talks with students about how competition makes them feel, and what they do about the feelings competition arouses, might be somewhat the equivalent of our play therapy with young children. Through play, children can get rid of their aggression without being fought back at and consequently are less afraid of themselves and less afraid of their own impulses; they know what it feels like to really smash things up, to use everything they've got just as hard as they can against something else. They aren't so fearful of feelings of anger afterwards; they know what destruction is and perhaps they don't need it so much; they know how to handle it within themselves; they know what to do with it. I think it would be very interesting to explore the differential effect that competition might have in various people in relation to their personality needs, how they feel about themselves, how they feel about others, therefore, what significance for their own emotional feeling competition has.

Question: Do you think it might be desirable for us to direct this spirit of competition more against ourselves, towards self improvement rather than measuring ourselves against someone else by attempting to become superior over someone else?

Dr. Jones: Don't you think though that this other may be worth exploring for certain kinds of people? You see, there are certain kinds of people who if they are helped to direct their feelings of competition against themselves would do it in a destructive way. You have to be cautious about that. It would be good for them, wouldn't it, really to compete against others and to realize that, in general, for everybody it was all in fun and to have it sort of decontaminated for them in that way. They need to be able to compete with themselves without tearing themselves to pieces by the way in which they would do it.

Comment from the floor: I believe we have some evidence that students can come through an intra-mural experience and competition with other girls on the college level, through even an intense experience in competition, with increased understanding of what competition is all about in terms of the feelings of the other group. In other words, I think we are trying to do a job in teaching of competition by providing good experience in competition. When we talk of competition at the elementary school level we have now some evidence that the parents, not the coaches, are the ones who want that highly competitive experience for the children. In one study, when the experimenter compared the opinions of parents from P.T.A.'s, of room teachers, of administrators, and of coaches, the least favorable to intensive competition at the level of these little children were the coaches, including women coaches, too. The most favorable were the parents--those parents, those mothers, appear to want glory for their children. They don't know a thing about what this terrific competition does to their young children, either physically or emotionally.

Miss Baker: We think we can do something through leadership in our field, and I think our usual way of going at it is to say these are the things we want done, these are the duties we want performed and then we leap on the first person we see with initiative to carry out the things to be done. We should be not only testing our duties and functions that we want performed but we should be thinking carefully about the different types of personality in trying to tie in the duties with the type of program. We should be studying our people and setting up a hierarchy of experiences, shouldn't we, of different levels of leadership suited to the people that we have?

Dr. Jones: I just wrote an article on this business of leadership and I think that the very thing that you do in terms of hierarchies of leadership illustrates that so much of our thinking about leadership is in terms of who is superior to whom. Who, therefore, can exert the most pressure and who is at the bottom and gets the most pressure? That is one whole thought system that we have for dealing with the business of leadership. That is status leadership. There is also the expert leader, the one who in respect to one trait is better, further out. I believe we think horizontally about some kinds of leaders. Further away on a scale, outside or away from the great mass who have the same quality only at a very ordinary level and that sort is the expert leader. Then there is also an Atlas leader, a person who feels that it all rests upon him and he can delegate only so far as he can find people who will carry

out exactly the thing that he sees must be done. The Atlas person feels that he is responsible and he will pull back his delegation of duties and responsibilities the instant that a person is not an adequate instrument for his use. There is also the chain-reaction leader who exercises leadership. This is the educator, the good educator, and I think, also the good administrative leader, the good any kind of leader who wants to develop in other people the ability to grow to have this quality of leadership so that they, in turn, can pass it on to others, to new leaders who will not want to keep leadership all for themselves. It is a sort of chain-reaction effect which good leadership tries to set off. I believe a good teacher sees that quite clearly, and I don't know why it is not fundamentally exactly the same concept if we translate our knowledge into group development, group dynamics, personality development, exactly the same concept carries over into administration, into human relationships of all sorts; that is real leadership, I think, democratic leadership. If we could look at the status leadership concepts that we use in building people up apart from others or away from others or the Atlas kind of leadership idea and critically evaluate them and work toward the other kind of concept--the chain reaction leadership, I think it opens up vitally interesting possibilities in human relations.

DISCUSSION GROUPS

(Following Address by Dr. Lloyd-Jones)

General Education Group

1. What responsibility does general education have, and physical education in particular, for providing guided experience in good human relations?
2. How can we develop desirable leadership qualities in our students, and how can we evaluate the example which we as leaders are setting?
3. How can physical education contribute to a curriculum of "developmental tasks"?
4. Assuming that the contribution of the individual to human relations is dependent upon individual emotional adjustment, social adjustment, and moral strength, how can physical education foster these qualities?
5. What are the peculiar possibilities of a physical education program for developing "skills for contact"?
6. In our physical education activities, how can we encourage attitudes of "moving toward" people, this contact skill being "The only one proper for a productive society"?
7. What steps do we as physical educators need to take to educate ourselves about a psychology of human relations?

Teacher Education Group

Midget competition. All were opposed in principal, but concerned with the source of the phenomenon. Maladjusted parents? Commercial sponsorship? Spectatoritis? Education's lack of attention to the child's needs and interests?

Inter-school competition condemned and praised. Canada has excellent plan for three colleges.

Inter-sex competition a problem with best athletes in a teacher training school.

The desirability of having a married woman on the staff was mentioned. Also the value of having a parent in the group. Some objection was made in favor of the single teachers who of necessity must bear the brunt of early and late assignments. However, that could be adjusted.

As a result of the emphasis on human relationships much discussion centered around inter-department problems, the isolation of the Physical Education department.

The difficulty of "selling" some of Physical Education standards should yield to efforts keyed to better understanding of the mores of the adolescent, and also to a better orientation on the part of the student.

The point was made that we are as a group emotionally attached to our field and correspondingly ignorant of other fields. Correlation needs to come from both sides. Even within our field we are attached to our special interest. For example Sports-minded people look askance at Dance etc. There is rivalry for prestige financial appropriations, administrative favors.

We must keep constantly before the students and faculty the essential common purpose of all areas of education.

INTRODUCTION OF MRS. OLIVE REMINGTON GOLDMAN

Mrs. Olive Remington Goldman is the United States Representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. In addition, Mrs. Goldman is Assistant Director for Women's Affairs and Volunteer Manpower in the Federal Civil Defense Administration with headquarters in the Chicago Regional Office. Mrs. Goldman has recently come from the meetings of the United Nations in Europe and brings to us the latest thinking of the group on the status of women. It is a pleasure to present to you this distinguished representative of our country. Mrs. Goldman.

INTRODUCTION OF MRS. OLIVE REMINGTON GOLDMAN

Mrs. Olive Remington Goldman is the United States Representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. In addition, Mrs. Goldman is Assistant Director for Women's Affairs and Volunteer Manpower in the Federal Civil Defense Administration with headquarters in the Chicago Regional Office. Mrs. Goldman has recently come from the meetings of the United Nations in Europe and brings to us the latest thinking of the group on the status of women. It is a pleasure to present to you this distinguished representative of our country. Mrs. Goldman.

WOMEN'S RESPONSIBILITY IN THE WORLD CRISIS

OLIVE REMINGTON GOLDMAN

Madam Chairman, Professor Baker, Dean Elliot and leaders of the Wellesley Alumnae:

Your chairman was far too kind! However, Governor Stevenson of Illinois said once after a most complimentary introduction, "Flattery's fine so long as you don't inhale." I held my breath while she was talking!

I am extremely happy to be able to be here today. I was very much pleased and flattered to be asked. It is many a year since I have been on the Wellesley Campus and the last time was as a stage director in a Harvard '47 Work Shop performance in the "Barn." I have never forgotten that enthusiastic audience and I have been anxious to talk at Wellesley ever since.

When I heard you were going to do a tape recording, Professor Baker, I was pleased that I did not have to read a script. But since my experience in correcting the "provisional" summary records of a hectic session at the United Nations in Geneva, I know that I do not always speak "in periods."

This Spring at the Palais des Nations the Provisional Summary Records were taken down in French and then translated into English and often seemed very remote indeed from my original remarks. I also found myself always hyphenated as "Mrs. Remington-Goldman."

The title on your program may seem a rather presumptuous and pompous one. And yet this particular symposium has produced it. You are a peculiarly appealing audience because of your primary interest in Physical Education. The psychologists, the anthropologist, and the general plan that all of you are concentrating on--how to bring together and diffuse the demands upon the physical and the spiritual of all women stimulates the hope that you may bring to fruition and your students, both the wisdom and the sense of balance which will pay off in solving the problems of the complicated world in which we now live.

Coming to you as I do quite fresh from a U.N. meeting in Europe--our Commission of the Status of Women meeting in April, and a State Department assignment that followed through central Europe, and then the government Staff College on Civilian Defense in England--I find that I have encountered repeatedly mistaken terms and conflicts which must be cleared away before talking of this "women business." Among both feminists and anti-feminists there is a conflict between the demands for rights on one hand, and an unwillingness to assume responsibilities on the other. The other thing that I think needs to be clarified is that there is a constant tendency among men and women to confuse the problem of equality with identity of treatment. Equality does not necessarily imply identity of treatment between the sexes.

I had three rather interesting examples of what I mean after the Status Commission met. In Austria I spent a great deal of time with the different political groups, both men's and women's, in Labor, Education and the Professions with governors and burgemeisters. I found that all of Austria was talking about the efforts in the conservative party to change their family laws. Curiously enough, it was the men of the party who thought

there should be a change, so that in every Austrian family the wife should be co-equal with the man before the law as head of the family, and it should no longer be the man alone who has complete control of all decisions; for example, of how the children should be educated.

To my amazement, the women's groups were opposing this idea with the remark: "Never! There would be chaos if there were two heads!"

One wondered a little bit whether those clever Viennese women were not afraid that if they assumed co-headship, technically, (I think most of them are in reality acting heads of their families) the men might evade some of their responsibility as breadwinners.

Another thing I ran into at the Status meetings was the need to explain to certain delegates why the U.S. was opposed to and had laws in some states prohibiting women from working underground. Some felt this was discrimination against women! I also, of course, ran into this criticism from all Communist delegates, because their contention is that women should work at all the hardest tasks in the country, as they most certainly do in the U.S.S.R.!

In trying to explain it, I fell back upon the problem of how we dress for such jobs. I pointed out that when my three daughters were out during the War to help with the corn crop, detasselling corn in the fields of Illinois, they wore blue jeans. Whereas you look at the picture of women working in Russia and you see them, for example, pouring hot asphalt in the streets of Moscow, clad in flapping, flimsy cotton skirts. I used that example to indicate that in this country we don't consider pouring asphalt or puddling steel, or digging coal, a woman's job. All of this and even heavier and more hazardous work is done in Russia by the women. If they resist assignment to such work, they can be penalized in many ways--even to depriving their babies of milk!

When I got back to New York I was surprised to find the same argument raging at the Human Rights Commission. The Human Rights Commission was split on whether they should write into the Human Rights Covenant, special rights for women.

My first job in the U.N. in '49 had been on the Human Rights Commission and talk for status in behalf of the anti-discrimination article which says there should be no discrimination because of race, color, creed or sex which was maintained. Yet at the meeting here in New York this last month, it was the men of the Commission (there were only three women--Mrs. Russell, of Sweden; our own Mrs. Roosevelt; and Hansa Mehta, of India) who said, "Let's write women's rights into the various articles about politics, equal pay, etc." Although the three women on the Commission resisted that viewpoint as gallantry, they were over-ruled, and specific rights for women were spelled out. I have always maintained that women, also, are people, and did not see why they should be especially mentioned when they had already been included in the basic Anti-discrimination Article.

The reason I am bringing this up is that I have the feeling that here at Wellesley you have avoided that particular pitfall. I do not think you have that kind of worry or struggle for "Rights." I do think, however, since I have been a teacher too, that all of us have the problem of persuading our students and the young people with whom we have contact that we must shoulder responsibilities in the world today.

One of the reasons I wanted to come here, Dr. Elliott, is that I had heard so much about this school from my friend, Professor Florence Lawson, who may have been known to many of you when she studied here. She has just retired at the

University of Illinois, and the dinner that was given for her last fall as tribute from faculty and students, is a thing I shall always remember. She was one of the most beloved and brilliant teachers at Illinois and she has made a lasting impression on our teachers and young people.

It isn't an easy thing that we are trying to do. Modern life itself is complicated, but the life of any woman in this day and age who is conscientiously interested in public affairs, is enormously involved. It isn't only a double responsibility either, because every single one of us are homemakers, many of us, also, are married and have young families. If we don't have children we have our aged to take care of, or our husbands, and many of us have a triple or a quadruple duty in community work, or jobs, or world affairs. And that takes a very special kind of ability and understanding, and team work such as we heard described in that very brilliant talk this morning, to do justice, as we must, to such varied demands.

I think our problem boils down to the question of whether American women are really going to be on the job when things begin to happen--and as our defenses--physical and spiritual shape up. I think we have great power to maintain peace if we really shoulder our responsibilities. That is the reason I am on leave from a Welfare Job, working in Federal Civilian Defense, because I think if we get organized to face the possibility of atom attacks, we are far less apt to get them. We know that the Russians have 40,000,000 involved in active civil defense. They are drafting their people into it. The Swedish have one out of every seven of their people in their defense force, and so far, we have very, very few of the 15,000,000 needed for adequate C. D. operations. That's one of the reasons I think women have got to be more alert to the particular dangers on our horizon, because I think if we are prepared, we are far less apt to be attacked. And so we may have gained more and more time to build the world we want and the peace we hope will come eventually.

I will tell you something of what has been happening in the U.N. Status affairs, because I think it reflects the way women are taking on responsibilities around the world. You know this Commission was set up six years ago to try and rid the world of discriminations against women in the fields of politics, employment, education, etc. There have been two very interesting demonstrations of the intense interest in this Commission within the last year. For one, the membership was increased from 15 to 18, because of the demand from various countries who wanted their women in. Also, the General Assembly, quite surprisingly, by a vote of 40 to 10, recommended that the Economic and Social Council keep the Commission on an annual schedule because it felt its work was so important. The only other Commission permanently on that basis is Human Rights.

Now the things that evolved out of the last meeting of the Status Commission in Geneva were rather interesting. For one thing, in increasing the membership to 18 we had 11 new members on the Commission, and those of you who work on committees, on a Board of Education, or Board of Trustees, etc., know something of what eleven new members in the body of 18 will do to a meeting. It meant a terrific burden of work for those of us who had had previous experience in the Agenda, and in U.N. procedure.

We faced there, also, the same problem that you feel in every U.N. meeting around the world--the conflict between the communists and those who still believe in freedom. I had to resist the Communist attack by myself for quite a long time, because the U.K. delegate, Mary Sutherland (and it is quite a tribute to England that Churchill sent their leading Labor women as a delegate to the Commission) was very late in getting there due to other obligations in her country; and the French delegate, our choice for Chairman was presiding. (Usually the U.S.S.R. and the other Iron Curtain delegates concentrated their criticism upon the three of us.)

The Russian delegate was making a long speech, one of her usual ones, as Mary Sutherland came in and sat down rather wearily. Finally as the Russian, Madame Popova, stopped speaking, Miss Sutherland reached for the microphone and told the Commission in her Scotch burr how sorry she was that she had missed four days of the meeting, "But," she said, "As I came in just now, I thought I was back in Beirut five years ago, or in New York last year, because, believe it or not, Madame Popova is making the same speech she was making then, and it certainly has not improved with r-r-r-repetition!"

But all the Russian speeches were not the same this year. The English delegate had missed the first and very stormy session, where we had heard not only the usual attack on the U.S., but an attack on all the work that had been done in the Commission which was termed "Useless" by the Russian delegate; and then a vehement charge that the United States had been committing terrible atrocities against women and children in Korea. (That awful W.I.D.F. report which some of you may have seen, which is entirely discredited, was brought up) And after that the accusation that we were using bacteriological warfare in North Korea! I expected the charge. I was almost certain we were going to get it, and I had with me the "Command" reports from Korea and I had all the refutation I needed. I found that the Communists do not like to be reminded that they have repeatedly refused impartial investigation by the International Red Cross of any of these false charges; nor, do they like the suggestion that they should check the aggressors in Korea. And, to my great amazement, they never raised the atrocity, nor the "Germ Warfare" issue again before the Commission at this session.

I have found that a swift and direct rebuttal, which shows the U.S.S.R. that you can make counter-communist propaganda will often turn them off. In one session in '51, I won three days' complete freedom from communist attacks--by a vigorous counterattack. We got on with our business then, and that is what is important!

Mary Sutherland missed that opening show, but she was there for the rest of it and I was certainly glad to have her. She is an eloquent and experienced debator.

Of course, the prime interest in that commission is political rights for women. When I first went on the commission I was reminded that our Government doesn't like international conventions (which is U.N. language for treaties). Yet, I felt that the United States, having full political rights for women, should back the countries that do not yet have them by trying to give them the means they thought would be most effective to get them, i.e., U.N. a "Convention" on Political Rights. So, I got permission from our Government (we are instructed delegates always, you know) to help draft such a convention. I could not vote for the third article the women wanted which calls for political rights for women to be appointed to public office, because our Legal Department in Washington says that appointed officers means also officers of the U.S. Army and Navy, and women cannot be drafted or go into combat duty; therefore, we cannot back a treaty which says, "appointive office." I pointed out that we have a woman brigadier general, head of our nursing service, and we have many women of high rank. Come another--an atomic--war, there will be no distinction as to sex! In England, you will remember, women started out as plane spotters, but before long they were firing the anti-aircraft guns. And so will we if the bombers come over. But that is the way it stood. I was, however, able to help the Convention along. It will go to the General Assembly this Fall, and although the wording isn't perfect and the U.S. had to abstain on Article 3, still it is a step ahead. If women can vote and be elected to public office, then they can take care of the things that are wrong in the laws of their own countries. That is, they should, as they gain political maturity. Women have the deciding voice in elections in this country; yet, I am afraid we don't always use our vote as effectively as we could.

I know very well that we don't, enough of us, run for public offices. Those who are qualified should both seek and accept nomination, when the political indicator points their way, as it does more often these days.

The next most important thing to Political Rights as far as college women are concerned, was the education item. There is a brilliant report put out by the International Labor Organization this year on "Vocational Education for women." It ties in exactly with some of the things that you Wellesley women are doing. Write directly to the United Nations, I.L.O., or Status of Women Commission for it if you are interested.

That also brought various arguments and attacks. Again the negro problem was raised by the communists, for no matter what subject was discussed, the difficulties encountered by negroes in the South was made an issue. I was glad to be able to tell them that the University of Illinois had a charming negro girl as homecoming queen last year. You know, sometimes small things of that sort mean a great deal. And I'm proud, too, to be able to tell you that our Physical Education department has two negro women on its staff without any feeling of discrimination or question of their competence and ability. I feel it's quite a step forward. I was glad too, to be able to mention that when the women gathered at Seneca Falls in our grandmother's day to plan a drive for votes for women it was the negro editor of the Seneca Falls paper, a Mr. Douglas, born in slavery, who gave them their greatest encouragement. I hadn't known that until I was researching for this Commission.

Now there is another thing that the U.S. brought in this year which I think is important to all of us, Economic Opportunities for women. The first is the familiar, "Equal Pay for Equal Work." It's an old item, but this year the I.L.O. drafted a convention which our delegate approved. It has not been ratified. We don't ratify freely. But I would like to remind some of you from states that don't have "equal pay for equal work" that you need to jack up your state laws! New Jersey, which is my original home state, came through with a sound equal pay law while I was at Geneva -- bless them!

The next problem (after equal pay for equal work, which is at the top under the economic Opportunities) were brand new American items. I got two of them on the agenda this year and a third will be added next year. One was Part-Time work for women, and I was particularly interested in that. While I was raising four children (and had an invalid mother-in-law at home, too) I couldn't go out and work full-time. And yet, had there been part-time work to do, I would have been glad to do it. There are many women with professional skills, such as you and the girls you teach, who would be happy to have a chance to work part-time. Our Womens' Bureau has done a wonderful study on the subject. The communists, of course, objected. They bore down very heavily indeed upon the way we "oppress" our women economically in this country! They don't want women to work part-time, they want them to work full time. To a laboring woman the term "part-time" is sometimes confused with what is meant as "short-time" when workers are cut down from their full time load in times of depression. We made that distinction very clear when we got it on the agenda. And I think it is, of course, one solution for the American way of life. We happen to believe that a woman's usual place is with her children while they are growing up. And yet many such women need to earn money to support the household. Part-time work is enormously important, I found, to the women of Austria, to the women of Denmark, to the women of Germany. Our study of opportunities for such work has roused both hope and enthusiasm.

The next point was Economic Opportunities for Older Women. I found the interest of European women in this pathetic and almost tragic. The women in business, and professional women, and in universities whom I met who are past middle age and who have had all economic opportunities closed to them, yearned and need to get back and exercise their professions. Of course, it isn't always that way.

Now in Austria, -----, I saw one factory, the state tobacco factory of cigarettes, (I have never seen a more beautiful place - complete air conditioning and no dust - lovely frescos - glass walls, magnificent lighting; it is really a dream factory!) where I was introduced to an old lady who had worked 50 years, had been retired on a pension, and decided she wanted to work again. So there she was back and quite happy in her job.

The third and the last economic item was postponed. It is discriminations against women in the professions. And there I had a curious argument with Bertha Lutz of Brazil (she knows more about frogs, I'm told, than any other person on earth!) She is a great feminist who was determined to get women written into the United Nations Charter, and did - at San Francisco. She wouldn't believe there were discriminations against professional women. But, I wondered, how many Deans do they have in the universities of Brazil, and I mean Deans of academic schools; how many women as full professors? Here again the Russian attack continued upon our "lack of opportunities" for women, the "laziness" of our women. We are a "pampered sex." We are kept in our homes and "put on a pedestal," etc. When the attack upon the American system became very violent I raised, as I frequently do, the problem of compulsory labor in the Russian system.

You all know the story. There are millions of people in Russia constantly in slave labor. But almost everybody in the Soviet orbit does "compulsory" labor. They can't change their jobs. If they are late to work three times, Soviet law sanctions six months forced labor without any pay at all. And slave labor is harder on the women than it is on the men, because it often means being snatched away from their children and it means a degradation and a horror of life that is indescribable. The documents that I have seen make one believe that books such as "My Eleven Years in Slave Labor" of Eleanor Lipper are entirely true. The documents are more shocking than one can describe. So I did raise that issue again and a very curious thing happened. Madame Popova brought up again the statement that she had made a year ago saying that in Russia "they took such good care of their women that if a woman were pregnant, she was permitted to change her job, and if she were pregnant, she could not be 'commandeered into a job'." I pointed out that in this country anybody is permitted to change their job and no woman can be commandeered into a job, whether she is pregnant or not! Whereupon the Russian delegate charged she was being slandered. I was very glad at that point that I had recently taught interpretation of Shakespeare at the University because I could retort that to the contrary:

"Upon their tongues continual slander rides stuffing the ears of men with false reports.

"They talk of peace - while covert enmity, under the mask of friendship - wounds the world."

The quotation was the more pat, because the Communists tried repeatedly to force peace (a problem of which the Security Council and the General Assembly are seized, and not the Commissions) upon our Agenda.

One thing which disturbed me very much was that all this attack, attack, attack from the communists means such a delay in our business that we had to postpone two very important items. One of them is family law. We have a good record in Family Law in this country, and the Russians have not. So I wanted the chance, with the questionnaires from all over the world coming in, to discuss it this year. We had, also, to put off the problem of Technical Assistance. And I am sorry about that too, because some of those things would have been of intense interest to you with your competence in dietetics and in physical as well as spiritual welfare. I hope that some of your students may be thinking of going into the international field to work with the World Health Organization, or under Technical Assistance. One

thing which took me to Yugoslavia was the knowledge that they had sent over a team of their best nurses, the physical education people and doctors, to work on rehabilitation of the physically handicapped on a U N grant. It is a very, very important job that they are doing and I was glad to see the Program developing in Belgrad and Zagreb.

This whole problem of physical well-being, ties into the things which are of great importance to us, diplomatically, as a nation. I wonder how many of you remember that when the San Francisco Conference was called last year that we didn't expect to get many signatures on the Japanese Peace Treaty from Pacific Nations. Some time before I had learned of a U.N. program in Indonesia to wipe out the disease of yaws - those horrible sores, you know, that are so debilitating and crippling for children. We had taken penicillin in and sent in a team of Physiotherapists and of doctors and we had almost wiped out the disease of yaws in Indonesia within about nine months. The women of Indonesia wrote the United Nations' World Health Organization. I cannot remember the words of the letter but in substance they said, "If you could but know the joy in our hearts - who have seen our children sick and dying - and now see them playing happily in the sun." I couldn't prove to you, of course, that when Indonesia marched up and took a pen and signed the Japanese Peace Treaty, leading a procession of Pacific Nations, that they were motivated by what the United Nations had done for their children, but I shall always believe it.

This is the inter-relationship between what we are trying to do to bring peace to the world, and what the individual can do in these special programs. They may seem remote, tiny, and yet they are building a world friendship and a world solidarity. Because we have somehow to get rid of hunger, and disease, and homelessness. And we have somehow to give to the have-nots of the world the sense that their freedoms can be preserved and that someone will come to their defense. That is why I think that the move toward collective security upon which we decided when we went to the defense of South Korea is one of the most important things that has ever happened in the world. We are still paying for it, and we have much to pay still, I am sure. My own son has just been commissioned in the Air Force, and I suppose he will be flying a jet there before very long. But I believe that it is the greatest blow that has been struck for freedom in this decade and I think, no matter what it costs us, it will in the end bring us closer to peace.

At this meeting of our commission I told you that there were many new delegates. Some of them were women who I knew had been told they must not vote against their communist neighbors. They live literally with the communist gun in their back. And often I was surprised at the way the voting went. Once I spoke to one of these women, saying that I was surprised. I had thought she would abstain on that vote. She smiled as she said, "You knew I had been told by my government that I must not vote, but when I listen, when I hear their attacks, suddenly before I know it, my hand goes up and I vote with you!"

I think the time has come when all of us have got to stand up and be counted. We cannot "abstain." We cannot be neutral. We are all seized with this problem of peace and the survival of freedom. I believe that most of it lies in our hands -- in what we can do now for freedom..... Thank you.

OPEN FORUM DISCUSSION
FOLLOWING ADDRESS BY MRS. GOLDMAN

Question: I know that one of our association members is going to the Far East in an WHO appointment. Do you feel that the best way for us to make contact and offer our services is through the WHO?

Answer: I think it is a wonderful way. It is an organization that has been singularly successful in the choice of the people they are sending out in the field. It isn't a do-good program, it is an attempt to help people help themselves. And the people they have sent out have been able to work in a team with people and I think any power, any help that you can give her would be helpful. You would be surprised at the number of women who are in our technical assistance programs here, there and throughout the world. But we don't have many women in the key spots in the U.N. yet. They are important as technical advisors and they are bringing in women from different countries.

Question: I know they are doing this program of fundamental education, I wonder if you feel that we could add to that, that we could have a share in that.

Answer: A fundamental education program is basic to all of our thinking, especially for the underprivileged, the Latin Americans, the Africans, and the Near and Far Eastern countries. Any place where the people are still ignorant. I believe completely in the UNESCO's fundamental education program, which includes education in health and spiritual matters at the same time. It is the only way you can make any impact on the thoroughly primitive peoples.

Question: We have been using the people's section reports for discussion meetings and I wonder whether there are any other papers of that type that you would suggest that they might use as the basis of discussion in their various groups.

Answer: The information service of our US mission to the U.N. gets out a book of different pamphlets on all of the different problems that are dealt with in the United Nations and presents the U.S. viewpoint. They are available to anyone who writes in for them. I would recommend to you this pamphlet our commission got out last year called "Political Education of Women." Written into it are the points that you cannot have genuine democracy unless you have a choice of candidates, and unless you have the protection of the secret ballot. That brought violent protest from the communist delegate. This year we voted to have this translated into Arabic for the use of the Arab countries. It was written by our secretariat and tried to satisfy all the countries of the U.N. It has the essentials of political education.

Question: We are working a great deal on scholarships and the exchange of students in our fields and we have been trying to find out how many colleges offer such programs. Do you feel there is any particular agency besides the International Institute of Education?

Answer: There is one thing that could be done. I ran into a great deal of this abroad because the people are crazy to send their young people to us. If it could be arranged through some of the steamship agencies to give free or reduced passage to such students, I believe some arrangements could be made. In a slack season, why shouldn't they put these students aboard? It is something, I think, that could be done by organizations such as this. I wish also that we we could send more of our young people abroad. I can think of nothing that would do more to increase understanding of people and meeting of minds.

FINAL SUMMARIES AND EVALUATION

Summary of the General Education Group Discussions by Dorothy Bateman

More questions were raised by this group, which numbered from 25 to 40 at the three sessions, than could be adequately covered. Although many comments and questions went unanswered, their implications and the trend of discussions served to spark our thinking and broaden our criteria for evaluating goals and procedures.

The statement "We should clarify the contributions physical education makes to general education" started the discussion and was referred to frequently in subsequent meetings.

We were concerned that the unique and far-reaching contributions physical education makes to the general aims of education are not more widely recognized. Only the purely physical benefits are understood--have we failed to demonstrate the social, intellectual, and human relations values inherent in physical education experience?

Many administrators regard physical education as an accessory to the curriculum--a necessary adjunct, but in a category apart from the academic. We must break down the fence that encloses it if it is to be accepted on equal footing with other subjects.

There must be understanding by the three groups concerned with the curriculum--faculty, students, and administrators. We must stimulate the thinking of those in all branches of education, enlightening them on what and how objectives are met. Closer cooperation with departments of psychology, sociology, and anthropology in providing techniques for improving social skills would be of mutual value in pointing up our common objectives.

A meeting of physical educators, college presidents, and those responsible for educational policy to interchange ideas and interpret our program might be an effective means of reaching an understanding on the place physical education should fill in general education.

We should critically examine our curriculum and evaluate it in terms of expected outcomes.

The increasing number of women combining family and career responsibilities, as pointed out by one of symposium speakers, has implications for physical education:

Is it helping to prepare women for the dual role they must play today?

How is it aiding her to satisfy interests in later life?

Is she equipped as a leader and participant in the recreational life of home and community?

In what way is it preparing for homemaking?

Training for home and community life is given by Home Economics because its subjects deal with fundamental living needs.

Physical education has an equally appropriate setting in the area of health. Have we approached negatively? Are we prone to be ethnocentric in attitude?

Physical education contributes many knowledges essential to successful living: techniques of relaxation and efficient use of the body; recreational activities to meet leisure time interests; understandings and skills in human relations.

Is preparation in these areas adequate?

Development of recreation resources, leadership potentialities, and opportunity for application of these skills in campus and community organizations must be assured. Courses such as Recreation Leadership reach only those interested at the time; the techniques should be provided for all, with the assumption that the experience will prompt her to become constructive when the need arises.

Are these subjects "suitable" for higher education?

The role physical education plays in the college curriculum must be adapted to the fundamental educational philosophy of the institution.

Therefore, we can not expect complete uniformity in college programs. Regardless of differences, however, statement of direction and general standards are the same.

Are we making the most of the ideal laboratory physical education provides for improving techniques in human relations?

No other field of education offers as advantageous an opportunity for acquiring skills and understandings in human relations through group participation.

We are certain that progress is made--but how can we convince administrators of results? Lack of tools for measuring these less tangible outcomes is a handicap. We should call on clinical psychology and sociology for help in setting up evaluation procedures.

Other recommendations for the college program:

Adapt instruction to the intellectual level of the student.

Give more advanced skills; more integration of skills in class periods, as occurs to a greater degree in dance activities.

Because lack of time often restricts class instruction to essential skills we must rely on extracurricular activities for application.

Make courses more academic, by giving more theory, more subject matter.

The "fun" element--the motivating force for many students--must not be slighted, however.

Other departments are more subject matter minded, but physical education aims beyond the acquisition of knowledge toward total development.

Application of principles of movement to all activity skills--as exemplified in Laban's movement studies.

More emphasis on planning procedures and situations for developing social skills--"associated learnings" are not necessarily a by-product.

We are often more concerned with teaching motor skills which should have been acquired earlier.

Transdepartmental courses through integration and correlation of related subjects.

The suggestion that we might see more clearly the wholeness of what we are doing by examining core courses at the colleges represented was carried out. Some 35 colleges and one high school reported, many including a resumé of the entire program.

Similarities in purpose and content are evident, but emphases, scope, and procedures vary.

Blanket requirements are the exception, all aiming to adapt the program to the individual.

Covered in most of the core courses are: orientation to the program and policies of the college; philosophy of physical education in terms of general education objectives; evaluation of individual needs and interests; instruction in basic motor skills; some phase of health instruction.

Evaluation methods used: motor ability tests, standardized or of local construction; physical examinations; questionnaires; individual conferences; group discussions; self-evaluation.

Accurate analysis of social, intellectual, and emotional traits is a common problem. The importance of evaluating these qualities in relation to total potentialities and interests was stressed, and many are experimenting in an effort to find more efficient methods. A significant procedure at one college is the use of sociometric tests, which with the results of additional studies, aid in giving the student an understanding of the kind of social and physical being she is.

Personal, social and community hygiene is taught in some courses in co-operation with health, sociology, and psychology departments.

Evidence of democratic procedures was noted in reports of student-staff planning of programs, student appraisal and discussion of courses.

Questions and comments not discussed, or recommended for further consideration:

What implications are there for reexamination of the type of leadership we are fostering?

How can competition be presented to effectively serve its many valuable purposes?

How can our program contribute to the adjustment of women in their ever-changing roles throughout the span of life?

How can we retain the values of group experience without loss of individualism?

Authoritarianism stifles initiative.

What are the techniques by which we communicate with others when personal relations are not possible?

What are we as human beings doing to improve our techniques of keeping alive the democratic process?

What in my behavior is inhibiting the democratic process? Is chain leadership a factor?

How can we contribute to better human relations?

The meetings concluded with the recommendation that many of these questions and others stemming from the talks of the symposium speakers be submitted to a committee for editing, discussed at future meetings, and used to help us evaluate our own situations.

Summary of Teacher Training Group Discussions by Dorothy W. Waterman

The teacher training group comprised members of both public and private professional schools or departments. This made for rich and stimulating discussions which were of benefit to all. Throughout there was a frank and intelligent sensitivity to the many and varied problems. Generous, thoughtful participation in exchanging ideas and viewpoints characterized the discussions.

There was general agreement to the need for better orientation of the students. To some the answer to this lay in pre-school indoctrination week; others rely on a series of departmental meetings wherein each phase of the course is demonstrated and explained; another solution suggested was to have a workshop meeting at the end of the term to evaluate the curriculum in terms of the aims sought.

The need for better orientation was expanded to include the relationship of the department to other departments, and the need for better intra-departmental relationships. In other words the basic idea of better human and departmental relationships permeated the entire educational picture.

The pros and cons of competition were as usual, a matter of discussion. The rise of the "Iddy Biddy" teams caused concern. Methods of combatting the spread of these juvenile teams were discussed. Possible causes of the phenomenon were sought. One suggestion was that it constituted a challenge to us as educa-

tors that we were not satisfying some deep need in the children. Is this a case of our having standards out of line with psychology? Can we substitute something better?

At the college level a plan of intercollegiate competition in four sports has been in effect in Canada on a high level. Four universities participate in a friendly three day meet. Expenses are borne by the Athletic Association the dues of which are part of the tuition fee. There is a separate meet for each sport, and each university is hostess for one. A player must have good academic standing and may not be on more than one team. It was reported as entirely satisfactory.

In the light of Dr. Kennedy's paper curriculum changes are in order. Statistics show that most women will marry, and later they will do part time work. More emphasis should be put on preparation for marriage and possibly some minor skill should be required (with vocational value). Personal resourcefulness in living and in recreation are essential. This applies to Major students as well as to non-professional students.

Difficulties are experienced in selling some Physical Education standards to students. These cannot be wholly solved by curricula changes. We must understand our own psychology and that of the adolescent. This may prevent our tendency to overemphasize on subject or skill while ignoring the personality we hope to shape.

Summary of the Recreation Group Discussions by Doris M. Hannan

The discussion group which concentrated on the field of Recreation was small. Its number never exceeded nine and for the majority of the meetings was composed of five people. The constant members of this group were primarily interested in college education, and their interest in recreation was secondary. Their discussion of recreation quite naturally revolved around the college student.

In considering recreation leadership it was noted that whenever possible it is highly desirable to have a team of recreation workers who have been trained in different types of schools (school of physical education, school of social work, and school of recreation). This type of leadership has proven valuable in community recreation.

Colleges meet the problem of recreation leadership in various ways on the different campuses. There are those who center the direction of campus recreation in the Physical Education Department where the head of the department is known as the Coordinator of Recreation. Others have a member of the Dean's Office directing the recreational affairs on campus. Some colleges appoint a faculty committee (composed of those members whose fields have strong recreational implications) to supervise the recreational program of their students. A fourth method is to have a committee of faculty and students direct recreational affairs.

The problems encountered in college recreation are numerous. Among those mentioned was the leader who puts too much emphasis on learning an activity and too little emphasis on the development of desirable recreational attitudes. This it was felt could be the pitfall of the physical educator who by all odds comes naturally by a recreational spirit superior to that of colleagues in other fields of education.

Another problem peculiar to colleges is that in some fields (art, drama, music, etc.) the leaders may not be interested in some of the recreational

It is difficult to evaluate the success of a symposium. It is successful as it has meaning for each individual. Our speakers were excellent and gave us a comprehensive background of ideas and facts concerning women of today. If some of our members felt that their own previous reading and experiences had made them already familiar with many of these facts, perhaps even they may have received some new idea or new point of view.

Throughout the symposium, discussion was extensive: clear, comprehensive thinking was evident; there was generous spirit of give and take. We shall go forth refreshed for having spent these few days together, inspired by the knowledge and experiences of others and challenged to extend our knowledge of human relationships to far horizons. The extent to which we carry forth these ideas determines the success of the symposium.

HONORED ALUMNAE
and
SYMPOSIUM PARTICIPANTS

DINNER FOR HONORED ALUMNAE

Thursday evening in the high raftered dining room of Claflin Hall, the Symposium met at dinner and did honor to fourteen living alumnae. These were among the older retired group, who had been recommended as having made noteworthy professional contributions in the field.

The four honored alumnae able to be present provided the highlights of the program through their interesting responses. Our oldest living graduate, Lillian Towne '91, amazed and delighted us all with her erect carriage, resonant voice, and keen perception of the modern scene. Anna Jaquith Connolly, Mabel Cummings, and Fanny Garrison gave us characteristic glimpses into the unique satisfactions each has found in her training and subsequent career.

A fitting climax to the dinner was the presentation to Ruth Elliott of a gift commemorating twenty-five years of service to the department at Wellesley, from staff, students, and alumnae. After her retirement in June, 1953, Miss Elliott plans to travel, and the gift will provide "some special side trip," in the words of Katharine Wells, who presented it.

A brief synopsis of the biographies of the fourteen honored alumnae:

Abbott, Senda Berenson '92 -- Taught at Smith College twenty years, adapted basketball to women, drawing up early rules. Pioneered in vigorous recreation program in sports as well as required work in gymnastics. Traveled and studied abroad. Founded fine professional library at Smith. Retired to marry Herbert V. Abbott, a member of the Smith College faculty. Now living in Santa Barbara.

Alden, Florence D. '06 -- Taught in a variety of college and school situations, best known for work in Public School Athletic League of Baltimore and University of Oregon (1921-43). Many offices and honors including President, Western Society Physical Education College Women, President, University of Oregon Chapter, Phi Beta Kappa. Author various professional articles.

Bouve, Marjorie '03 -- Taught in various schools in and near Boston, then pioneered as one of founders of Boston School of Physical Education which later became Bouve-Boston School. Was its director from 1915-48. Among her professional honors, offices and services are: Honor award A.A.H.P.E.R., 1932; President Eastern District A.P.E.A.; Consultant in Japan to Tokyo Y.W.C.A.; Trustee, Greater Boston U.S.O.; etc.

Connolly, Mrs. Anna Jaquith '99 -- After teaching in public schools began work with handicapped in Clark Institute for the Deaf, then went into physical therapy and was in charge of physiotherapy, Worcester Memorial Hospital from 1931-52. Has served Worcester Community Council through Physical Rehabilitation Committee.

Cumming, Mabel Louise '97 -- Taught in public schools in Boston area then went to Middle West and West Coast, was head at the University of Oregon for six years before returning to Wellesley as head. After leaving Wellesley in 1927, became director of Teacher Training in New Jersey State College for Women until retirement in 1939. Served on committees of various State Societies and the N.A.A.F., was elected Honorary Fellow of New Jersey State Society in 1932.

Davis, Sarah Russell '07 -- Known as authority in corrective gymnastics and headed this work at B.N.S.G., Wellesley, Colorado College, and University of California. Held various offices in M.H. Alumnae Association, State and District

associations. Author of numerous talks and articles in the field of corrective work.

Garrison, Fannie '03 -- Taught in Eastern private schools before joining Wellesley staff for long and faithful service as instructor and recorder. Served on many committees of various associations, known to all of us as long time Executive Secretary Mary Hemenway Alumnae Association.

Haagenson, Mary '98 -- Specialized in corrective and remedial work, long and useful service in sanitariums and medical clinics before teaching her specialty at Wellesley, 1917-25. Known to many students who lived at 1 Waban as kind and competent head of that house. Now connected with "My Inn," 1 Haviland Street, Boston. Author of talks on her specialty before Eastern Society.

Lee, Mabel '10 -- Taught in various colleges before head at Nebraska 1924-52. Known as author and administrator. Among many honors and offices are Gulick Award, Honor Award A.P.E.A., Fellow American Academy of Physical Education, LL.D. Coe College, President and Vice President A.P.E.A., President A.A.P.E., Member National Board Youth Hostels, Civilian Advisory Committee for W.A.C., Women's Division Physical Fitness, F.S.A., etc. Author "Conduct of Physical Education," "Fundamentals of Body Mechanics" (co-author) and numerous talks and articles.

Norris, J. Anna '95 -- Physician and administrator taught and supervised in public schools before long and successful service as head at University of Minnesota (1912-1941). Among many offices and honors are: President & Vice President, Midwest P.E.A., President Midwest A.P.E.C.W., Honor Award A.A.H.P.E.R., Fellow American Academy of Physical Education, Author many talks and papers.

Perrin, Ethel '92 -- After teaching at B.N.S.G. and other colleges, went to Detroit public schools where she became famous and left a noteworthy physical education program, and which she served as Supervisor from 1909 to 1923. She left to become director of American Child Health Association. Among her honors and offices are Gulick Award, Honor Award of A.P.E.A., President of Mary Hemenway Alumnae Association, and various district and state offices. Has contributed frequently to national programs from 1926 to 1951.

Towne, Lillian May '91 -- After teaching in high schools in Boston area, became the first woman principal of a Boston grammar school. Served Bowdoin School and Thomas Gardner School until retirement in '34. Served on various state and local committees in general education, Vice President Boston Elementary School Principals. Honor award by Massachusetts Council of Churches for outstanding service in religious education, 1951. Author many talks, especially on health education, now collaborating with Prof. Claire Turner of M.I.T. on a health record card system for N.E.A.

Trilling, Blanche Mathilde '09 -- First year of teaching as head at University of Missouri, then 34 years at University of Wisconsin as head, where she built up a nationally known department. Honors and offices include Gulick Award, Honor Award A.P.E.A., Fellow American Academy, President Midwest A.P.E.C.W., Vice President Midwest P.E.A., President, Madison Civics Club, etc. In great demand for talks and program contributions during all of professional career.

Van Haagen, Winifred '04 -- After varied experience in teaching and recreation leadership gave 30 years' service to State Department of Education in California. Her continuity and indefatigable efforts large factor in exceptional state program. Honors and offices include Honor Award, A.A.H.P.E.R., Honorary life member Western A.P.E.C.W., Nu Sigma Psi, San Francisco United California A.A.H.P.E.R., many committees of N.A.P.E.C.W., N.A.A.F., Vice President Mary Hemenway Alumnae Association, many offices in state and local associations. Author of numerous bulletins published by California State Department and co-author of two classics on elementary school program - the last in 1951.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION SYMPOSIUM REGISTRANTS
WELLESLEY COLLEGE

June 26 - 28, 1952

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Ainsworth, Dorothy | Smith College |
| Ames, Virginia | New Jersey College for Women |
| Arnett, Martha Elliott '44 | Hazard, Kentucky |
| Atwell, Ruth '20 | George Washington University |
| Baker, Gertrude '15 | University of Minnesota |
| Ball, Jean | State Teachers College, Brockport, New York |
| Barr, Helen '19 | Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin |
| Barry, Joyce Cran | Marblehead, Mass. |
| Barta, Judith (Mrs.) | Sarah Lawrence College |
| Bateman, Dorothy '17 | Cornell University |
| Beall, Elizabeth | Wellesley College |
| Beedem, Helen | Jackson College |
| Breding, Dorothea | Women's College, University of North Carolina |
| Browning, Henrietta '16 | Converse College |
| Bullen, Beverly '50 | Wellesley College |
| Burdett, Rita | Woman's College, University of North Carolina |
| Child, Eunice | The Beard School, Orange, New Jersey |
| Cohane, Edith | Oswego State College, New York |
| Cook, Marion '15 | Wellesley College |
| Davis, Dorothy | Woman's College, University of North Carolina |
| Davis, Nancy | Skidmore College |
| Decker, Lois | State Teachers College, Bridgewater, Mass. |
| Delano, Anne | Wellesley College |
| Desch, Elizabeth | Briarcliff Junior College |
| Drager, Jane Scott | Hunter College |
| Duffey, Ruth '16 | Boston University |
| Elliott, Ruth '14 | Wellesley College |
| Erskine, Katharine Forbes '15 | Worcester, Mass. |
| Evans, Ruth | Springfield College |
| Foland, Catherine | Hood College |
| Fowler, Frances | |
| Gill, Barbara '39 | State Teachers College, Brockport, New York |
| Gillette, Mary | Boston YWCA |
| Goodridge, Lillie '16 | New York City |
| Grout, Julia '24 | Woman's College, Duke University |
| Haidt, Marie | Pennsylvania State College |
| Halsey, Elizabeth '16 | State University of Iowa |
| Hannan, Doris '40 | Cedarcrest College |
| Hartman, Emily | Sargent College, Boston University |
| Hazelton, Helen '19 | Purdue University |
| Heimbach, Althea | Milwaukee Downer College |
| Holland, Margaret | Barnard College |
| Holman, Dorothy | State Teachers College, Danbury, Conn. |
| Homewood, Jean '37 | Bouve-Boston School |
| Houston, Sally '35 | Oberlin College |
| Howard, Evelyn Boldrick '45 | Wellesley, Mass. |
| Howard, Mildred | Mount Holyoke College |
| Hubbard, Vickey | University of Massachusetts |
| Hughes, Hazel | Clark University |

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Jacques, Dorothy | Wellesley College |
| Karpovich, Josephine Rathbone '22 | Teachers College, Columbia University |
| Kees, Helena '15 | New Jersey College for Women |
| Kilcoyne, Eleanor | Brooklyn College |
| Kim, Shinsil | EWHA Woman's University, Korea |
| Kjellstrom, Louise Shutz '32 | New York City |
| Kuester, Lillian | Mount Holyoke College |
| Langelier, Muriel '26 | Syracuse University |
| Luttgens, Kathryn '51 | Women's College, University of North Carolina |
| Mackey, Anne | Hunter College |
| Manchester, Ethel '08 | Newport, Rhode Island |
| Manchester, Gertrude '13 | State College for Women, Georgia |
| Marchant, Janet | Colby College |
| Marsh, Mrs. Jean | Wellesley College |
| Marshall, Louise Howe '16 | Providence, Rhode Island |
| Martus, Ethel '31 | Women's College, University of North Carolina |
| McCullough, Edna | Kansas State Teachers College |
| Miller, Mary Louise | DePauw University |
| Morrill, Claramond Harper '32 | Reeds Ferry, New Hampshire |
| Mossdrop, Alfreda '19 | Vassar College |
| Munro, Iveagh | McGill University |
| Muir, Muriel | Boston University |
| O'Shea, Harriet | Purdue University |
| Paulding, Margaret | Skidmore College |
| Pelz, Irma | New Haven Teachers College |
| Petrosky, Helen | Hiram College |
| Phillips, Helen '41 | Sargent College |
| Plimpton, Elizabeth '31 | Alice Deal Junior High School, Washington, D.C. |
| Pope, Elizabeth | State Teachers College, Bridgewater, Mass. |
| Rearick, Elizabeth '22 | MacMurray College |
| Reynolds, Margaret '51 | Guilford College |
| Robinson, Marian | Wellesley College |
| Rockwood, Grace '20 | Syracuse University |
| Rogers, Gertrude S. | Sr. High School, Westfield, New Jersey |
| Rogers, Marion | University of Maine |
| Rotchford, Lucille | Georgia Military College |
| Rudd, Bessie '24 | Pembroke College |
| Russell, Helen '37 | Smith College |
| Rutherford, Dorothy | Montreal YWCA |
| Schroeder, Elinor | Wellesley College |
| Shaw, Marguerite | Centenary Junior College |
| Simpson, Dorothy | New Jersey College for Women |
| Smith, Marion | Hood College |
| Smith, Natalie '38 | Bouve-Boston School |
| Smyth, Patty | Centenary Junior College |
| Snyder, Priscilla | Woman's College, University of North Carolina |
| Spurrer, Merle '22 | University of Rochester |
| Stevens, Hannah | Boston YWCA |
| Stifel, Helen (Mrs.) | Lake Erie College |
| Sweet, Ruth Page | Bouve-Boston School |
| Talbot, Jean '22 | Winona State Teachers College, Minnesota |
| Taylor, Bernice | State Teachers College, Framingham, Mass. |
| Thorsen, Margaret '45 | Springfield College |
| Totman, Ruth | University of Massachusetts |
| Van Dyke, Mary Elizabeth '49 | Woman's College, University of North Carolina |
| Verhultz, Lucille | Syracuse University |

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Wagner, Thelma | McGill University |
| Walker, Sally | Centenary Junior College |
| Walmsley, Lee | Bates College |
| Waskowich, Helen | New Jersey College for Women |
| Waterman, Dorothy '19 | Bayside High School, New York City |
| Wells, Katharine '34 | Wellesley College |
| White, Christine | Wheaton College |
| White, Jane '46 | Lake Erie College |
| Wilbraham, Hazel | University of Rochester |
| Yallourakis, Evangelie | Alexandria, Egypt |
| Yates, Fern | Barnard College |
| Yeakel, Helen, '26 | Indiana University |